DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 655 HE 010 351

TITLE	Characteristics and Attitudes of the Financial Aid Administrator. (A Report on the Survey of the Profession in 1977.)
INSTITUTION	National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	201p.; Tables may be marginally legible
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, 910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 217, Washington, D.C. 20006 ($10.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Background; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Management Development; *National Surveys; *Professional Recognition; Questionnaires; Research Projects; Salaries; Status; *Student Financial Aid; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Professional Development

ABSTRACT

Data obtained from a survey of financial aid administrators in institutions of higher education, conducted to document the status of this rapidly expanding profession on a national basis, is organized into seven major sections. They include: (1) basic characteristics, such as age, sex, racial/ethnic background, and educational level; (2) salary levels; (3) attitudes on adequacy of salary, authority, status levels, etc,; (4) office characteristics, such as staff size and responsibility for student employment; (5) external contacts with the U.S. Office of Education, Congress, or state agencies; (6) professional development, discussed in terms of compensation for conferences, course work, or membership in professional association; and (7) research activities. Responses to the survey are presented in bivariate format using the Crosstabs computer system, with each table including the number of respondents and percentages. Each series of tables is accompanied by a narrative that highlights some of the findings. The first appendix reports the salaries of financial aid directors by institutional type, control, size, and geographic area. The second and third appendices contain copies of the 1974 and 1977 survey questionnaires. A brief review of earlier research is included in the preface. (JMD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES OF THE FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATOR

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NASFAA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NASFAA

CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES

OF THE

FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATOR

(A Report on the Survey of the Profession in 1977)

National Association of Student
Financial Aid Administrators
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

NASFAA is a non-profit corporation of institutions of postsecondary education and other individuals, agencies and students who are interested in promoting the effective administration of student financial aid in the United States. The results of this survey are intended to help the general public better understand the characteristics and attitudes of those individuals who are directly responsible for administering student aid funds and to focus upon those areas where additional attention needs to be directed to upgrade the profession.

This objective analysis, coupled with future action designed to improve current deficiencies, will lead to an improved and more efficient system of administering student financial aid services.

Copies of this survey may be ordered from the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, 910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 217, Washington, D.C. 20006. The price is $10.00 per copy, and payment must accompany orders.

Editorial or copyright inquiries concerning this publication should be directed to the Executive Director of NASFAA at the above address.

Copyright © 1978 by NASFAA
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table Number(s)		Page(s)
	Preface	v-xiv
	Acknowledgements	xv
	Organization of the Report	xvii-xviii
	Section A - Basic Characteristics of Student Financial Aid Administrators	1
1-1, 1-2	Institutional Size, Control, Type	3- 4
1-3	Age	5
1-4 to 1-7	Sex	6- 7
1-8 to 1-11	Racial/Ethnic	8-10
1-12 to 1-14	NASFAA Membership	11-12
1-15	Employment Status (Full-Time, Part-Time)	13
1-16	Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid	14
1-17	Other Area of Responsibility	15
1-18 to 1-20	Years of Employment in Financial Aid	16-17
1-21	Educational Level	18
1-22	Geographic Location	19
1-23, 1-24	Academic Level of Students Served	20-21
1-25 to 1-27	Central or Non-Central Office	22-23
1-28 to 1-32	Tenure	24-26
	Section B - Salaries of Student Financial Aid Administrators	27
2-1 to 2-9	Salaries	29-38
	Section C - Attitudes	39
	Salary	41
3-1 to 3-10	Adequacy of Salary Compared to Outside of Respondents' Institution	41-46
3-11 to 3-20	Adequacy of Salary Within Respondents' Institution	47-52
	Job-Related Characteristics	53
4-1 to 4-4	Enough Authority to do Job Effectively	53-55
4-5 to 4-7	Superiors Have Clear Idea of Job Being Done by Respondent	56-58

Table Number(s)		Page(s)
4-8 to 4-11	Recognized as Holding an Important Position	59- 61
4-12 to 4-16	Financial Aid as a Career	62- 64
	Communications and Training	65
5-1 to 5-3	Adequacy of Communications	65- 66
5-4 to 5-8	Adequacy of Training	67- 69
	Federal Programs	70
6-1 to 6-3	Interfund Transfers (Campus-Based Programs)	70- 71
6-4 to 6-6	Administrative Allowance (GSL, BEOG)	72- 73
6-7 to 6-8	Revision of Tri-Partite Application Process	74- 75
6-9 to 6-11	Adequacy of the Regional Panel Process	76- 77
6-12 to 6-14	Need for Periodic Federal Program Reviews	78- 79
6-15 to 6-17	Received Good Support from the Regional Office of Education	80- 81
	Miscellaneous	82
7-1 to 7-4	Aid for Full-Time and Half-Time Students	82- 84
7-5 to 7-8	Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs	85- 87
7-9 to 7-14	Certification of Aid Administrators	88- 91
	Section D - Office Characteristics	93
	Staffing	95
8-1 to 8-13	Staff Size and Adequacy of Staff	95-102
	Immediate Supervisor	103
9-1 to 9-3	Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid	103-105
	Student Employment Responsibilities	106
10-1 to 10-3	Office Responsibility for Student Employment	106-107
	Need-Based Awards	108
11-1 to 11-3	Percentage of Awards Based on Computed Need	108-109
	Section E - External Contacts	111
12-1 to 12-6	External Contacts (USOE, Congress, State Agencies, etc.)	113-118

Table Number(s)		Page(s)
	Section F - Professional Development.....	119
13-1 to 13-5	Major Conference Preferred.....	121-123
13-6 to 13-9	Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings.....	124-125
13-10	Release Time for Instate Meetings.....	126
13-11 to 13-15	Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings....	127-129
13-16	Paid Release Time for Out-of-State Meetings	130
13-17 to 13-19	Expenses Paid for Workshops.....	131-132
13-20	Paid Release Time for Workshops.....	133
13-21 to 13-25	Expenses Paid for Course Work.....	134-136
13-26	Paid Release Time for Course Work.....	137
13-27, 13-28	Office Subscriptions.....	138
13-29 to 13-40	Institutional Willingness to Pay for Individual Memberships in State, Regional, National Associations.....	139-143
	Section G - Research Activities.....	145
14-1 to 14-15	Recent Financial Aid Research Projects.....	147-154
	Appendix A - Financial Aid Directors' Salaries by Institutional Type, Control, and Size and by Geographic Area.....	155-167
	Appendix B - 1974 Survey Questionnaire	169
	Appendix C - 1977 Survey Questionnaire	177

Preface

Beginning in 1972, federal expenditures for student aid began to increase significantly and the role of the institutional aid administrator became even more important than it had been in the past. In spite of the vital role that these administrators were performing, comprehensive data on a national basis about their professional skills and attitudes had not been compiled. Therefore, the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators in 1974 commissioned William J. Bushaw, of the University of Iowa, to conduct a national survey to determine the function, education, status, and other relevant information about this rapidly expanding profession. In preparing this first national survey, Mr. Bushaw reviewed previous studies which had been conducted on a limited scale to determine what changes had occurred in the profession during the past few years.

Earlier Studies about the Profession

The first of these studies which Bushaw reviewed was the study conducted by George Nash and Paul F. Lazarsfeld in 1968 entitled, "New Administrator on Campus: A Study of the Director of Financial Aid." From their study a great deal of useful information was gathered concerning the work and characteristics of aid administrators at senior institutions. A year later in 1969 James B. Puryear presented a study which essentially repeated the work of Nash and Lazarsfeld, entitled, "Two-Year College Financial Aid Officers." The population for this survey was taken from a sample of two-year colleges, and the results were generally similar, except that the two-year administrator was slightly older and tended to have a smaller supporting staff than did the administrator from the four-year school. The Puryear study was reported in the Journal of College Student Personnel, January 1974.

In 1970, Warren N. Willingham surveyed the financial aid administrators' present level of professional development. Using a representative sample of 122 institutions in the West, Willingham, for the first time, included questions dealing with training needs and attitudes concerning future development of the profession. Among the major findings were (1) the annual turnover rate was somewhat lower and interinstitutional hiring somewhat higher than before; (2) workshops were the favored method of maintaining professional competence; and (3) one-third of the aid administrators could be classified at a low level of professional development in the sense that they were involved in few professional activities. The Willingham study, "Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers: Higher Education Surveys Report No. 2," was published by the College Entrance Examination Board in November 1970.

Clarence L. Casazza completed still another study in 1970, entitled, "Career Patterns of Financial Aid Directors," which was reported

in the Journal of Student Financial Aid in November 1971. Casazza studied career patterns of financial aid directors at 179 institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more and received usable responses from 73% of his sample. Data obtained from the survey showed (1) the Master's degree was the typical degree for financial aid directors; (2) there appeared to be a definite relationship between institutional attendance and employment; (3) financial aid directors came to their positions from a wide range of work experiences; and (4) the typical aid director held his position between two and five years.

In 1972 Wayne O. Chambers conducted "A Survey of the Professional Development of Student Financial Aid Administrators in Nine Southern States." Using an adaptation of the Willingham questionnaire, Chambers surveyed student financial aid administrators in nine southern states which comprise the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. The population surveyed included 600 institutions of postsecondary education and, of that number, 388 provided usable returns. Some of the major findings were (1) about half of the respondents had three or more years' experience in financial aid; (2) 60% rated medium to high on professional development; (3) the median age was 37.3 years; (4) two-thirds had at least a Master's degree; and (5) professional meetings and workshops were the two most favored methods of maintaining professional competence.

Also patterning his research design after the Willingham study, Ronald J. Schiesz in 1973 surveyed the professional characteristics of financial aid directors at colleges and universities throughout Illinois. The population was comprised of 128 Illinois student financial aid administrators with a usable response of 92 questionnaires. This data revealed that the Illinois aid administrators were then slightly older, had been in the position longer, were more mobile, and were more likely than previously to have a Master's degree. The Schiesz study reported in the March 1974 issue of the Journal of Student Financial Aid was entitled, "A Study of Certain Professional Characteristics of Financial Aid Administrators at Institutions of Higher Education in the State of Illinois."

The review of these earlier studies emphasized the need for a national survey and, therefore, at the direction of NASFAA's National Council, a questionnaire was developed and mailed in late March 1974 to 3,643 directors of financial aid at institutions of postsecondary education which participated in the Office of Education sponsored programs of student assistance. (A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix B.) Responses were received from 1,954 individuals for a 54% return rate.

Major Findings and Conclusions of the 1974 Survey

The data obtained from 1,954 financial aid directors in the 1974 survey provided insight into (1) background characteristics; (2) professional characteristics; (3) academic background; (4) job orientation; (5) maintenance of professional competence; (6) degree of professionalization; (7) needed professional development; and (8) characteristics of the aid administrator. With this information, Bushaw was able to

develop a "national" description of the financial aid administrator. His major findings and conclusions are reported by the above-listed eight areas of emphasis.

1. Background Characteristics

The typical financial aid director was a male Caucasian between the ages of 36 and 40 years.

Although nearly three out of four financial aid directors were male, the percentage of female financial aid directors was increasing in 1974. Additionally, women were most likely to be employed by a private four-year institution.

One out of ten financial aid directors was a member of a minority group. Two-year institutions afforded the greatest percentage of employment opportunities for minority financial aid directors, followed by private institutions.

The average age of financial aid directors fell within the 36-40 year age range, which is consistent with earlier studies. Although financial aid directors in two-year institutions were slightly younger on the average, the gap was narrowing from earlier studies. There was, however, a gradual drop in the number of financial aid directors past their mid-forties who were working at two-year institutions.

2. Professional Characteristics

In nearly two out of three instances, financial aid directors devoted full time to their positions. If the position remained part-time, the employer normally was a two-year, a private graduate/professional, or a proprietary institution.

The typical director had worked in financial aid approximately the same amount of time as he had been director. Although still low, those reporting experience in financial aid prior to assuming the director's position were increasing.

Employment in postsecondary education provided a career path into financial aid. With the exception of proprietary institutions, private business was furnishing fewer financial aid directors than it had previously.

In 1974 the annual turnover rate was decreasing. In just 3% of the cases, the financial aid director had less than one year's experience. Only financial aid directors at proprietary and public graduate/professional institutions exceeded the previous rate of 20%. On the other hand, nearly seven of every ten financial aid directors had three or more years' experience. In fact, the number having worked in financial aid five years or longer approached 50%.

Directors' salaries had advanced to the $12,000-$13,999 range in 1974, but were not keeping pace with inflation. Financial aid directors at two-year and public four-year-and-beyond institutions had the highest average salaries. Women typically received lower salaries than men.

This difference, however, was tempered by the fact that a larger percentage of the women was employed by two- and four-year private institutions, which had the lowest average compensation for all financial aid directors.

3. Academic Background

Approximately one-fifth of the financial aid directors had degrees from their employing institutions. If the director held a degree from an employing institution, it was usually the undergraduate degree and the institution was a private one.

The Master's degree, if not a formal requirement for a financial aid director, was an informal one. Of those responding, over 60% had a Master's or higher degree. A financial aid director with a Doctorate remained a rarity.

If the financial aid director was pursuing a degree, it was usually the Master's followed by the Doctorate. For those planning degree work, the Doctorate was the choice most often selected.

There was considerable difference between the academic courses thought "Useful" and the ones the financial aid directors had taken themselves. Of those courses listed in the 1974 survey, only counseling had been taken by a majority of financial aid directors.

4. Job Orientation

As in previous studies, there was a wide difference between the courses thought "useful" in orienting new financial aid administrators and those "I had" upon becoming a financial aid administrator.

Although not ranked as high in previous studies, the internship method was still the most desirable way of obtaining practical experience. However, only a few financial aid directors had ever had the opportunity for such an experience. As far as actually receiving practical experience, on-the-job training was overwhelmingly rated the way most financial aid directors had obtained practical experience. In addition, on-the-job training, although ranked behind the internship method, received increased favor over previous studies as the best way for new financial aid administrators to obtain practical experience.

Financial aid directors, when asked to express a preference for workshop topics for either new and/or experienced financial aid administrators, advocated topics dealing with "practical," "immediate," and "survival" type skills and information.

5. Maintaining Professional Competence

Attending professional meetings, participating in workshops, reading professional periodicals, and meeting periodically with Regional Office of Education officials were all favored ways financial aid directors preferred to keep current in 1974. Coursework and summer institutes were the least favored ways of maintaining professional competence.

It was interesting that the closer the professional meeting was to the director's home base, the greater its importance was as a preferred way to keep current. Furthermore, respondents favored methods of keeping current which were direct, to the point, and could be covered in a relatively short period of time.

The financial aid director was likely to belong to both a state and a regional financial aid association and institutions were likely to contribute toward the director maintaining professional competence by providing released time and paying expenses to attend financial aid meetings and workshops. Institutions also usually paid for office subscriptions and memberships in financial aid associations.

6. Degree of Professionalism

Although the majority of the financial aid directors belonged to professional associations, it was disappointing that the percentage was not higher. There was room for further improvement, especially at the regional level.

Financial aid directors were somewhat involved in professional activities and kept well informed on matters of current importance in fninancial aid. However, as the degree of active involvement increased, there was a marked drop in participation. Publishing continued to rank extremely low in the hierarchy of activities, but this low rating did not appear to reflect a lesser regard for publishing by the financial aid director. Rather, it appeared to reflect that there was little provision made or reward given for publishing.

7. Needed Professional Development

All of the possibilities listed in the 1974 questionnaire were thought to have importance in further development of the profession. Immediate training for new financial aid administrators received the greatest support, followed by providing opportunities for professional growth to those in smaller aid operations and for developing self-study materials for new financial aid administrators. The establishment of graduate programs in financial aid, although important, had the least amount of support.

8. Characteristics of the Aid Office

According to the 1974 survey, the financial aid director held a position of esteem within the institution's administrative hierarchy. Although there was a variety of organizational possibilities, the director usually reported to the vice-president for student services, and consequently, reported through no more than one person to reach the president. When the financial aid director did not report to the vice-president for student services, the most common practice was for him/her to report directly to the president.

Financial aid directors were responsible for administering a large number of highly complex programs, each with separate requirements and guidelines. In addition, they participated in a variety of activities,

both within and outside the institution. Although the financial aid director's position had a great deal of responsibility, the institution typically filled the position with someone of less experience than the director felt was necessary, and provided him with inadequate staff support. When added staff support was provided, it was usually at the clerical level. Consequently, out of necessity, many clerical employees were functioning as para-professionals, resulting in a whole new set of educational and training needs for this type employee.

The results of the 1974 survey were not distributed to the participants because of limited financial resources, but data from this study was used during the next two years by NASFAA in shaping its programs and policy positions.

In 1977, the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (MASFAA) published a comprehensive study of student aid administrators in the midwest. The study was conducted by the MASFAA Research Committee, which in 1976-77 was chaired by Harvey P. Grotrian.

Following a review of the MASFAA study, the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators decided that a similar study should be conducted on a nationwide basis. Accordingly, NASFAA established a "Survey of the Profession Committee," consisting of the following three members: Dr. Robert B. Holmes, Office of Financial Aid, The University of Michigan; Mr. Harvey P. Grotrian, Office of Financial Aid, The University of Michigan; Ms. Karen Dickinson, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Building from the 1974 survey and the MASFAA survey, it was decided that the 1977 survey would focus on such areas as salaries, attitudes, office characteristics, sources of information, and professional development.

A total of 3,450 questionnaires were mailed to financial aid administrators employed by educational institutions. (A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix C.) A total of 2,775 of the questionnaires were mailed in late August 1977 to individuals holding NASFAA membership. An additional mailing to 675 individuals employed in offices serving graduate/professional students was made from a separate mailing list in October 1977. Follow-up postcards were sent to both groups to remind them to return the questionnaire.

A total of 1,912 questionnaires were returned by mid-January 1978. Due to the duplication between the two mailing lists used for the survey, it is estimated that 61.0% of the unduplicated number of individuals receiving the questionnaire returned it by mid-January 1978.

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, the 1977 survey was designed so that all replies were treated with the strictest confidence, and it was not possible to connect anyone with his or her responses. However, since it was not possible to identify respondents,

it was also not possible to identify non-respondents. Therefore, the survey results are only applicable to the respondents and should not be generalized, or at least should be very carefully generalized, to the larger population of financial aid administrators.

The data obtained from the 1,912 respondents in the 1977 survey provided insight into (1) background characteristics; (2) salary levels; (3) attitudes and opinions; (4) office characteristics; (5) external contacts; (6) professional development; and (7) research activities.

The major findings and conclusions of the 1977 survey are reported by the above-listed seven areas of emphasis.

Major Findings and Conclusions of the 1977 Survey

1. Background Characteristics

The typical financial aid director in 1977 was a male Caucasion, 38 years of age, employed full-time. Even though 67% of financial aid directors were male, the percentage of female financial aid directors had increased by 9% since the 1974 survey. In addition, female administrators were more likely to be employed in the proprietary sector (52%), followed by the independent sector (43%).

One out of ten financial aid directors was a member of a minority group. With the exception of Spanish surnamed administrators, minority administrators (Blacks, Native Americans, and Orientals) had a greater tendency to be women than did white respondents and were more likely to be employed at public institutions.

The median age of directors remained stable at 38. Associate/assistant directors had a median age of 33, while the median age for counselors was 34.

Aproximately half of the aid administrators had worked in financial aid six years or more with 3% reporting 16 years or more experience. 13% of the directors had one year or less experience.

As in earlier studies, the financial aid director with a Doctorate degree remained a rarity (6%), while 52% of the directors had a Master's degree.

2. Salary Levels

Institutional control and size are primary determinants of salary level. For example, directors' salaries were significantly higher at public institutions ($19,050) followed by $14,430 at independent institutions and $12,620 at proprietary institutions.

3. Attitudes and Opinions

The need for increased authority for interfund transfers received overwhelming support from all varieties of institutional type, control, and size

Over 81% of the respondents agreed that receipt of a federal administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility by their institution for the BEOG and GSL programs.

Dissatisfaction with the current Tri-Partite Application process and panel review procedures was evident. 80% of the respondents agreed that the Tri-Partite process should be changed to depend more upon verifiable, historical data and only 50% of the respondents agreed that the panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions.

The need for periodic program reviews by the U.S. Office of Education was underscored by the fact that over 90% of the respondents agreed that they were necessary.

Over 85% of the respondents agreed that their institutions had received good support from their Regional Office of Education.

A total of 85% of the responcents disagreed that there had "been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs" at their institution.

4. Office Characteristics

The results of the 1977 survey reveal that the majority of the directors think they have enough authority to do their job effectively. In addition, they feel they are recognized by others in their institution as holding an important position and agree that financial aid is sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career.

As in an earlier survey, the majority of directors in public and private institutions reported to a chief administrator for student activities. Directors at proprietary institutions were more likely to report directly to the president than were directors at other types of institutions.

5. External Contacts

Slightly over half of the respondents indicated that they had not contacted the office of a member of the U.S. Congress regarding a financial aid problem or issue during the last year. Contact with federal officials is more frequent with approximately 75% of the respondents reporting that they had contacted a DHEW/USOE official in Washington during the past year. An even higher frequency of contact (88%) was reported with regional officials. In addition, approximately one-fourth of the respondents had written or called the NASFAA office in the past year.

6. Professional Development

Professional financial aid training programs were judged to be adequate by over 84% of the respondents. However, respondents with doctorate degrees were twice as likely to find training inadequate, as were respondents holding other degrees. Another group of respondents

finding training programs inadequate was employed in offices serving graduate/ professional students. Respondents from the rocky mountain region were most satisfied with training programs, while the respondents from the western region were the most dissatisfied.

If respondents were able to attend only one major conference per year, approximately equal numbers would attend either their regional conference (39%) or their state conference (42%). Directors from public institutions were almost twice as likely to express a preference for attending the NASFAA annual conference as were directors from independent institutions.

Over 95% of the respondents reported that their institutions were willing to pay the expenses for their attendance at instate meetings, and expenses for out of state meetings would be paid for 83% of the respondents. Institutions also usually pay for office subscriptions and memberships in financial aid associations.

Over 85% of the respondents agreed that communications from NASFAA and regional associations were adequate to keep them informed about current issues in financial aid.

7. Research Activities

Just over 30% of the directors of financial aid responding to the 1977 survey reported that their office had conducted research on topics related to financial aid within the past two years. Respondents from large institutions were more than twice as likely to conduct research projects than were respondents from small schools. Of the directors conducting research projects, the impact of financial aid programs was addressed in over one-half of the projects. The results of the research were primarily used for financial aid office operations and policy making.

While a comparison of the 1974 and 1977 surveys is not possible because of the differences in the items contained in the two respective questionnaires, there are numerous data elements which are compatible. The chart on the following page lists these elements and shows the percentage of respondents in each category:

	1974	1977
Institutional Control		
Independent	49%	50%
Public	46%	42%
Proprietary	5%	8%
Median Age	36-40	38
Sex		
Male	76%	67%
Female	24%	33%
Ethnic Origin		
Black	7%	6%
Native American	1%	0.05%
Oriental	0	0.05%
Spanish Sur-Named	2%	2%
White	90%	89%
Other	0	2%
Level of Education		
High School Diploma or Other	5%	11%
Associate	5%	4%
Bachelors	28%	27%
Masters	58%	52%
Doctorate	4%	6%
Years of Employment in the Student Financial Aid Profession		
1 year or less	13%	14%
4 years or more	44%	68%
16 years or more	2%	3%
Median Salary Levels by Type of Institution		
All Types	$13,000	$16,250
Public	15,000	19,050
Independent	11,600	14,430
Proprietary	11,000	12,620

As the number of individuals employed in the financial aid profession continues to grow, and as the administration of financial aid programs becomes more complex, it is essential that future studies on the characteristics and attitudes of aid administrators be continued. While the tables presented in this survey represent only a few of the many combinations that could be presented, it is hoped that they will answer many questions and help to define other issues that should be addressed in the future. It is also hoped that the results will underline the importance and critical needs of the total financial aid profession.

Editors

Joyce Dunagan, Assistant Director, NASFAA
Dallas Martin, Executive Director, NASFAA

Acknowledgements

When NASFAA decided to conduct the initial survey in 1974, as well as the second survey in 1977, a primary goal was to document the "Status of the Profession" on a national basis in hopes of improving the overall administration and support for student financial aid services at all postsecondary educational institutions. From the beginning it was decided that the identification of critical literature and the collection of accurate information would be dependent upon the cooperation of many people. That assumption proved to be very true since literally hundreds of our financial aid colleagues contributed to this effort. There are however, several individuals who should be recognition by NASFAA for their special efforts. In particular, special recognition is given to William J. Bushaw for compiling the first survey. In addition, special thanks also is given to the following individuals for their help with the first survey. They include Dr. William Snider, from the University of Iowa, who helped develop the computer programs; Dr. James Maxey, from the American College Testing Program, for advice on constructing the tables; and Dr. Al Hood, University of Iowa for overseeing the study.

A special recognition also is given to Robert B. Holmes, Harvey P. Grotrian, and Karen Dickinson, all of the University of Michigan for designing, conducting, and compiling the second survey.

In addition, a special thank you also is given to Ms. Carol W. Van Dyke and Ms. Diane L. McCallum, who are members of the administrative staff at the University of Michigan, for their assistance in preparing this report.

Organization of the Report

The data in this report is organized into seven major sections which include:

1. Basic Characteristics
2. Salary
3. Attitudes
4. Office Characteristics
5. External Contacts
6. Professional Development
7. Research Activities

Each section is identified separately in the Table of Contents for ease in reference. The responses to the questions are presented in a bivariate format using the Crosstabs computer system. Each table includes the number of respondents falling into each category, as well as row and column percentages. For example, in the table shown below, it can be seen that respondents' titles and regions are being compared.

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

	EASFAA	SASFAA	MASFAA	SWASFAA	PRASFAA	WASFAA	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	392	221	397	139	75	154	1378
TOR	28.447	16.038	28.810	10.087	5.443	11.176	100.000
	74.102	76.207	70.766	81.287	85.227	66.094	73.611
ASSOC./	46	17	64	10	8	21	162
ASSIS.	28.395	10.494	39.506	6.173	4.869	12.963	100.000
DIRECT.	8.696	5.862	11.408	5.848	9.545	9.013	8.654
FIN.AID	55	28	52	10	0	36	185
OFFICER	29.730	15.135	28.108	5.405	2.162	19.459	100.000
COUN/AD	10.397	9.655	9.269	5.848	0.545	15.451	9.882
OTHER	36	24	48	12	5	22	147
	24.490	16.327	32.653	8.163	3.401	14.966	100.000
	6.805	8.276	8.556	7.018	5.682	9.442	7.853
COLUMN SUMS	529	290	561	171	88	233	1872
	28.259	15.491	29.968	9.135	4.701	12.447	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

A total of 1,872 individuals responded to both questions. There were 392 directors from EASFAA states who responded. Directors of financial aid from EASFAA states comprised 28.447% of the total number of directors responding to the survey (1,378). In addition, the directors from EASFAA states represented 74.102% of the 529 respondents from EASFAA states. In the aggregate, directors of financial aid represented 73.611% of the respondents, while EASFAA respondents comprised 28.259% of all respondents.

The total number of respondents varies slightly from one table to another due to some questions not being answered or due to unusable responses. In some cases, however, the number of respondents varies since the table only includes selected categories. For example, in order to permit the comparison of salaries among a homogeneous group,

salary tables only include individuals who are employed full-time and who devote at least 50% of their employment time to financial aid.

Each series of tables is accompanied by a narrative which highlights some of the findings. In some cases, the chi-square test of statistical significance is employed.

Section A

Basic Characteristics of Student Financial Aid Administrators

TABLE 1-1 Institutional Size by Institutional Control

TABLE 1-2 Institutional Size by Institutional Type

Almost half (49.6%) of the respondents to the survey were employed at independent institutions and just over 42 percent were employed at public institutions. Eight percent of the respondents were from proprietary schools.

Approximately 63 percent of the respondents from public institutions were employed by institutions with enrollments of over 4,000 students as compared to less than one-fourth of those from independent institutions and less than 2 percent of those from proprietary institutions.

Respondents were employed in a wide range of institutional types. The largest group was employed in 4-year institutions which offered advanced degree work (36.9%). Slightly over two-thirds of this group were from institutions with enrollments of over 4,000. The next largest group was 4-year institutions with the majority (88.6%) of these having enrollments of under 4,000. Nursing schools had both the smallest number of respondents (40) and the smallest institutional size (all were under 1,000).

TABLE 1-1 Institutional Size by Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION	COLUMNS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE					
	UNDER 1000	1000-3999	4000-9999	10,000-19,999	20,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	78	211	196	158	158	801
	9.738	26.342	24.469	19.725	19.725	100.000
	12.704	37.882	63.430	67.234	89.773	42.359
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	408	325	112	75	18	938
	43.497	34.648	11.940	7.996	1.919	100.000
	66.450	58.348	36.246	31.915	10.227	49.603
PROPRIETARY	128	21	1	2		152
	84.211	13.816	0.658	1.316		100.000
	20.847	3.770	0.324	0.851		8.038
COLUMN SUMS	614	557	309	235	176	1891
	32.470	29.455	16.341	12.427	9.307	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-2 Institutional Size by Type

ROWS - INSTITUTIONAL TYPE
COLUMNS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

	UNDER 1000	1000-3999	4000-9999	10,000-19,999	20,000+	ROW SUMS
VOC.	114	28	11	9	2	166
TECH.	68.675	16.867	7.831	5.422	1.205	100.000
	19.128	5.176	4.276	3.913	1.143	8.992
2 YEARS	114	120	69	39	16	358
& UNDER	31.844	33.520	19.274	10.894	4.469	100.000
NOT V.T	19.128	22.181	22.697	16.957	9.143	19.393
4 YEAR	194	209	24	20	8	455
	42.637	45.934	5.275	4.396	1.758	100.000
	32.550	38.632	7.895	8.696	4.571	24.648
4 YEAR	50	162	191	143	135	681
AND	7.342	23.789	28.047	20.999	19.824	100.000
BEYOND	8.389	29.945	62.824	62.174	77.143	36.891
NURSING	40					40
	100.000					100.000
	6.711					2.167
GRAD/	84	22	7	19	14	146
PROFES.	57.534	15.068	4.795	13.014	9.589	100.000
ONLY	14.094	4.067	2.303	8.261	8.000	7.909
COLUMN SUMS	596	541	304	230	175	1846
	32.286	29.307	16.468	12.459	9.480	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-3 Age of Student Financial Aid Administrators by Title

Almost 75 percent of the respondents to the survey were Directors of Financial Aid. Less than 10 percent of the respondents fell into each of the remaining 3 categories of "Associate/Assistant Director," "Financial Aid Officer/Counselor/Advisor," or "Other." The "other" category included a wide variety of respondents including the following job titles:

1. Coordinator of Financial Aid
2. Coordinator of Student Services
3. Dean of Student Services
4. Acting Director of Financial Aid
5. Registrar and Director of Financial Aid

The median age of Directors was approximately 38. Associate/Assistant Directors had a median age of 33, while the median age for Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors was 34.

Table 1-3 Age by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = AGE

	UNDER 25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-50	51-59	60+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	73	256	274	218	288	223	64	1396
	5.229	18.338	19.628	15.616	20.630	15.974	4.585	100.000
	58.871	66.841	74.863	78.700	76.190	78.799	75.294	73.629
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	17	51	38	16	22	18	5	167
	10.180	30.539	22.754	9.581	13.174	10.778	2.994	100.000
	13.710	13.316	10.383	5.776	5.820	6.360	5.882	8.808
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	22	53	27	18	36	20	10	186
	11.828	28.495	14.516	9.677	19.355	10.753	5.376	100.000
	17.742	13.838	7.377	6.498	9.524	7.067	11.765	9.810
OTHER	12	23	27	25	32	22	6	147
	8.163	15.646	18.367	17.007	21.769	14.966	4.082	100.000
	9.677	6.005	7.377	9.025	8.466	7.774	7.059	7.753
COLUMN SUMS	124	383	366	277	378	283	85	1896
	6.540	20.200	19.304	14.610	19.937	14.926	4.483	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-4 Through 1-7 Sex of Student Financial Aid Administrators

Almost 63 percent of the respondents were men, while 37 percent were women. The majority of the respondents in 3 of the title categories were men, with women comprising 56.7 percent of the "Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors" category (Table 1-4). 78.3 percent of the men responding to the survey were Directors, as opposed to 65.5 percent of the women.

As seen in Table 1-5, women respondents tended to be younger than men, with the median age of women being 35 as opposed to 38 for men (significant at the .01 level). 35.2 percent of the women were 30 or under, while 21.7 percent of the men were in this age category. There were also significant differences (at the .01 level) between men and women based on their place of employment. For example, women responding to the survey were less likely than men to be employed in public institutions and more likely than men (42.7% vs. 26.6%) to be employed in institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (Tables 1-6 and 1-7).

Table 1-4 Sex by Title

ROWS - TITLE COLUMNS - SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	930	462	1392
TOR	66.810	33.190	100.000
	78.283	65.625	73.573
ASSOC./	98	69	167
ASSIS.	58.683	41.317	100.000
DIRECT.	8.249	9.801	8.827
FIN.AID	81	106	187
OFFICER	43.316	56.684	100.000
COUN/AD	6.818	15.057	9.884
OTHER	79	67	146
	54.110	45.890	100.000
	6.650	9.517	7.717
COLUMN	1188	704	1892
SUMS	62.791	37.209	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-5 Sex by Age

ROWS = AGE COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	58 46.774% 4.878%	66 53.226% 9.375%	124 100.000 6.550
26-30	200 52.356% 16.821%	182 47.644% 25.852%	382 100.000 20.180
31-35	259 70.765% 21.783%	107 29.235% 15.199%	366 100.000 19.334
36-40	202 72.924% 16.989%	75 27.076% 10.653%	277 100.000 14.633
41-50	247 65.691% 20.774%	129 34.309% 18.324%	376 100.000 19.863
51-59	171 60.638% 14.382%	111 39.362% 15.767%	282 100.000 14.897
60+	52 60.465% 4.373%	34 39.535% 4.830%	86 100.000 4.543
COL SUMS	1189 62.810 100.000	704 37.190 100.000	1893 100.000 100.000

Table 1-6 Sex by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	578 72.160% 48.696%	223 27.840% 31.766%	801 100.000 42.401
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	537 57.249% 45.240%	401 42.751% 57.123%	938 100.000 49.656
PROPRIETARY	72 48.000% 6.066%	78 52.000% 11.111%	150 100.000 7.941
COLUMN SUMS	1187 62.837 100.000	702 37.163 100.000	1889 100.000 100.000

Table 1-7 Sex by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	315 51.303% 26.560%	299 48.697% 42.653%	614 100.000 32.538
1000-3999	365 65.647% 30.776%	191 34.353% 27.247%	556 100.000 29.465
4000-9999	224 72.964% 18.887%	83 27.036% 11.840%	307 100.000 16.269
10,000-19,999	162 68.936% 13.659%	73 31.064% 10.414%	235 100.000 12.454
20,000+	120 68.571% 10.118%	55 31.429% 7.846%	175 100.000 9.274
COLUMN SUMS	1186 62.851 100.000	701 37.149 100.000	1887 100.000 100.000

TABLES 1-8 Through 1-11 Racial/Ethnic Background of Student Financial Aid Administrators

Approximately 10 percent of the respondents were minorities. The Black respondents, totaling 132, represented 6.9 percent of the total number completing the questionnaire.

Two-thirds of the respondents in each racial/ethnic category (with the exception of Oriental) were Directors. Minorities were more likely than whites to be in the categories of "Associate/Assistant Director" and "Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors." For example, 8.9 percent of the whites were Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors, while 18.2 percent of the Blacks fell into this category (Table 1-8).

As seen in Table 1-9, minority respondents tended to be slightly younger than did majority respondents. For example, whites had a median age of approximately 38, while minorities (Blacks, Native Americans, Orientals, and Spanish Surnamed) had a median age of approximately 33.

Table 1-10 highlights the relationship between the race and sex of respondents. With the exception of Spanish Surnamed respondents, minority respondents (Blacks, Native Americans, and Orientals) had a greater tendency to be women than did white respondents.

Minorities, with the exception of Native Americans, were more likely to be employed at public institutions than were white respondents (Table 1-11).

Table 1-8 Race by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI-CAN	ORIEN-TAL	SPANISH SUR-NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	84	5	6	23	1249	26	1393
TOR	6.366	0.358	0.429	1.645	89.342	1.860	100.000
	67.429	71.429	37.500	67.647	78.838	78.788	73.579
ASSOC./	12	1	1	3	146	4	167
ASSIS.	7.186	0.599	0.599	1.796	87.425	2.395	100.000
DIRECT.	9.091	14.286	6.250	8.824	8.701	12.121	8.789
FIN.AID	24	1	5	6	149	3	188
OFFICER	12.766	0.532	2.660	3.191	79.255	1.596	100.000
COUN/AD	18.182	14.286	31.250	17.647	8.880	9.091	9.895
OTHER	7		4	2	134		147
	4.762		2.721	1.361	91.156		100.000
	5.303		25.000	5.882	7.986		7.737
COLUMN SUMS	132	7	16	34	1678	33	1900
	6.947	0.368	0.842	1.789	88.316	1.737	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-9 Race by Age

ROWS = AGE COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI-CAN	ORIEN-TAL	SPANISH SUR-NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	11	1	3	3	104	2	124
	8.871	0.806	2.419	2.419	83.871	1.613	100.000
	8.333	14.286	18.750	8.824	6.198	6.061	6.526
26-30	32	2	8	9	327	4	382
	8.377	0.524	2.094	2.356	85.602	1.047	100.000
	24.242	28.571	50.000	26.471	19.487	12.121	20.105
31-35	30	1	1	11	317	6	366
	8.197	0.273	0.273	3.005	86.612	1.639	100.000
	22.727	14.286	6.250	32.353	18.892	18.182	19.263
36-40	21	1	1	2	249	4	278
	7.554	0.360	0.360	0.719	89.568	1.439	100.000
	15.909	14.286	6.250	5.882	14.839	12.121	14.632
41-50	18	2	2	8	340	9	379
	4.749	0.528	0.528	2.111	89.710	2.375	100.000
	13.636	28.571	12.500	23.529	20.262	27.273	19.947
51-59	14		1	1	262	7	285
	4.912		0.351	0.351	91.930	2.456	100.000
	10.606		6.250	2.941	15.614	21.212	15.000
60+	6				79	1	86
	6.977				91.860	1.163	100.000
	4.545				4.708	3.030	4.526
COL SUMS	132	7	16	34	1678	33	1900
	6.947	0.368	0.842	1.789	88.316	1.737	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-10 Race by Sex

ROWS = SEX COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI-CAN	ORIEN-TAL	SPANISH SUR-NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
MALE	64	4	5	28	1072	22	1191
	5.374	0.336	0.420	2.015	90.008	1.847	100.000
	49.231	57.143	31.250	70.588	63.962	66.667	62.816
FEMALE	66	3	11	10	604	11	705
	9.362	0.426	1.560	1.418	85.674	1.560	100.000
	50.769	42.857	68.750	29.412	36.038	33.333	37.184
COLUMN SUMS	130	7	16	34	1676	33	1896
	6.857	0.369	0.844	1.793	88.397	1.741	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-11 Race by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI-CAN	ORIEN-TAL	SPANISH SUR-NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	74	1	12	21	684	12	804
	9.204	0.124	1.493	2.612	85.075	1.493	100.000
	56.061	14.286	75.000	61.765	40.811	37.500	42.383
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	54	6	2	12	850	17	941
	5.739	0.638	0.213	1.275	90.329	1.807	100.000
	40.909	85.714	12.500	35.294	50.716	53.125	49.605
PROPRI-ETARY	4		2	1	142	3	152
	2.632		1.316	0.658	93.421	1.974	100.000
	3.030		12.500	2.941	8.473	9.375	8.013
COLUMN SUMS	132	7	16	34	1676	32	1897
	6.958	0.369	0.843	1.792	88.350	1.687	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-12 Through 1-14 NASFAA Membership of Student Financial Aid Administrators

A total of 83.8 percent of the respondents stated that they were NASFAA members.* There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between title and NASFAA membership, with Directors of Financial Aid having the highest incidence of membership (87.5%) and the "Other" category having the lowest (64.1%).

As shown in Table 1-13, respondents who stated that they were not NASFAA members tended to be slightly younger (significant at the .01 level) than NASFAA members. Furthermore, men were slightly more likely to hold NASFAA membership (85.9%) than were women (80.3%) and this relationship was significant at the .01 level. There were no significant differences in NASFAA membership among racial/ethnic groups.

---

*The data on NASFAA membership may be spurious to the extent that the responses may have been affected by the change in NASFAA membership from individual to institutional which occurred during the summer of 1977. It is possible, therefore, that some respondents who held membership in NASFAA, but whose institutions had not yet become members, indicated that they did not have current NASFAA membership.

Table 1-12 NASFAA Membership by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = MEMBER NASFAA?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1217	174	1391
TOR	87.491	12.509	100.000
	76.879	56.863	73.637
ASSOC./	135	31	166
ASSIS.	81.325	18.675	100.000
DIRECT.	8.528	10.131	8.788
FIN.AID	138	49	187
OFFICER	73.797	26.203	100.000
COUN/AD	8.718	16.013	9.899
OTHER	93	52	185
	50.135	35.862	100.000
	5.875	16.993	7.676
COLUMN SUMS	1583	306	1889
	83.801	16.199	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-13 NASFAA Membership by Age

ROWS = MEMBER NASFAA? COLUMNS = AGE

	UNDER 25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-50	51-59	60+	ROW SUMS
YES	88	312	313	236	320	236	78	1583
	5.559	19.709	19.773	14.908	20.215	14.908	4.927	100.000
	70.968	82.322	85.989	85.818	84.433	83.392	91.765	83.801
NO	36	67	51	39	59	47	7	306
	11.765	21.895	16.667	12.745	19.281	15.359	2.288	100.000
	29.032	17.678	14.011	14.182	15.567	16.608	8.235	16.199
COL SUMS	124	379	364	275	379	283	85	1889
	6.564	20.064	19.269	14.558	20.064	14.981	4.500	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-14 NASFAA Membership by Sex

ROWS = MEMBER NASFAA? COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
YES	1017	563	1580
	64.367	35.633	100.000
	85.995	80.314	83.820
NO	167	138	305
	54.754	45.246	100.000
	14.105	19.686	16.180
COL SUMS	1184	701	1885
	62.812	37.188	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-15 Full-Time or Part-Time Employment Status by Title

A total of 93.8 percent of the respondents were employed full time on an annual basis. Respondents employed on 9-month contracts and those employed less than full time represented only 6.2 percent of the total number of respondents. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in employment status based upon title.

Table 1-15 Employment Status by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = FULL/HALF-TIME EMPLOYMENT

	FULL TIME	LESS THAN FULL	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1301	97	1398
TOR	93.062	6.938	100.000
	73.009	82.906	73.618
ASSOC./	163	4	167
ASSIS.	97.605	2.395	100.000
DIRECT.	9.147	3.419	8.794
FIN.AID	176	11	187
OFFICER	94.118	5.882	100.000
COUN/AD	9.877	9.402	9.847
OTHER	142	5	147
	96.599	3.401	100.000
	7.969	4.274	7.741
COLUMN SUMS	1782	117	1899
	93.839	6.161	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-16 Amount of Employment Time Devoted to Student Financial Aid by Title

The majority (57.8%) of the respondents spent 100 percent of their employment time on matters pertaining to student financial aid. However, there were a number of differences based upon title. Respondents in the title category of "Other" were the least likely to spend their full time devoted to financial aid concerns. Slightly over 43 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid devoted less than 100 percent of their time to financial aid.

The most striking difference between respondents who spend various amounts of employment time administering financial aid programs is based upon "the kinds of students" served by their office and whether or not their office is the central financial aid office on campus (See Tables 1-24 and 1-27). For example, 28.6 percent of the respondents in offices serving only graduate/professional students spent 100 percent of their employment time in financial aid, while the percent was almost three times as high among respondents employed in offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students. At the other end of the spectrum, only 4.5 percent of the respondents from offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students spent less than half of their employment time on financial aid matters, while the figure was over 50 percent for respondents in offices serving only graduate/professional students. These differences were significant at the .01 level.

Respondents working in the central financial aid office on a campus were more likely to spend 100 percent of their employment time in financial aid (60.5%) than respondents working in non-central aid offices (22.2%). This difference was significant at the .01 level.

Table 1-16 Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid by Title

ROWS = TITLE — COLUMNS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID

	100%	75-99%	50-74%	LESS THAN HALF	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	794	286	147	173	1400
TOR	56.714	20.429	10.500	12.357	100.000
	72.247	77.929	77.778	70.040	73.607
ASSOC./	138	18	8	3	167
ASSIS.	82.635	10.778	4.790	1.796	100.000
DIRECT.	12.557	4.905	4.233	1.215	8.780
FIN.AID	115	16	16	21	168
OFFICER	61.170	19.149	8.511	11.170	100.000
COUN/AD	10.464	4.809	8.466	8.502	9.884
OTHER	52	27	18	50	147
	35.374	18.367	12.245	34.014	100.000
	4.732	7.357	9.524	20.243	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1099	367	189	247	1902
	57.781	19.295	9.937	12.986	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-17 Primary Other Area of Responsibility for Respondents Devoting Less Than 100 Percent of Their Working Time to Student Financial Aid by Title

Of the respondents reporting that they spent less than 100 percent of their employment time working in a financial aid office, approximately one-fifth indicated that the Office of Admissions was their primary other area of responsibility. 44.8 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors stated that the Office of Admissions was their primary other responsibility, and aside from the title category of "Other," it was the most prevalent choice for respondents in the remaining three title categories. Approximately an equal number of respondents stated that they had responsibilities in either the Dean of Students Office or the Business Office.

Table 1-17 Other Area of Responsibility by Title

ROWS = TITLE	COLUMNS = PRIMARY RESPONSIBILTY OUTSIDE FINANCIAL AID								
	DEAN OF STUDNTS OFFICE	OFFICE OF REG-ISTRAR	OFFICE OF CAR-EER PLN	OFFICE OF ADM-ISSIONS	COUN-SELING CENTER	BUSI NESS OFFICE	TEACH-ING	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	73	26	33	112	21	91	45	176	577
TOR	12.652	4.506	5.719	19.411	3.640	15.771	7.799	30.503	100.000
	74.490	65.000	80.488	73.203	70.000	85.849	80.357	73.950	75.722
ASSOC./	3	1		13			1	11	29
ASSIS.	10.345	3.448		44.828			3.448	37.931	100.000
DIRECT.	3.061	2.500		8.497			1.786	4.622	3.806
FIN.AID	8	9	2	7	9	11	3	19	68
OFFICER	11.765	13.235	2.941	10.294	13.235	16.176	4.412	27.941	100.000
COUN/AD	8.163	22.500	4.878	4.575	30.000	10.377	5.357	7.983	8.924
OTHER	14	4	6	21		4	7	32	98
	15.909	4.545	6.818	23.864		4.545	7.955	36.364	100.000
	14.286	10.000	14.634	13.725		3.774	12.500	13.445	11.549
COLUMN	98	40	41	153	30	106	56	238	762
SUMS	12.861	5.249	5.381	20.079	3.937	13.911	7.349	31.234	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-18 Through 1-20 Number of Years of Employment in the Student Financial Aid Profession

Approximately half of the respondents reported having 6 years or more of experience in financial aid administration. Financial aid experience totaling 11 years or more was reported by 16 percent of the respondents (Table 1-18).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in years of employment based upon sex and race. For example, as shown in Table 1-19, women had a median length of employment of between 4 to 5 years, while the median for men was approximately 6 years. Whites, Blacks, and "other" racial/ethnic groups were the only respondents to have worked for 11 years or more in the financial aid profession. The majority of the respondents in the Native American, Oriental, and Spanish Surnamed groups had between 4 and 10 years of experience (Table 1-20).

Table 1-18 Years of Employment by Title

ROWS - TITLE COLUMNS - NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	182	238	279	452	197	52	1399
TOR	13.009	17.012	19.871	32.309	14.081	3.717	100.000
	70.270	68.195	73.545	74.342	81.405	83.871	73.709
ASSOC./	20	35	36	52	19	4	166
ASSIS.	12.048	21.084	21.687	31.325	11.446	2.410	100.000
DIRECT.	7.722	10.029	9.524	8.553	7.851	6.452	8.746
FIN.AID	15	49	38	50	11	1	189
OFFICER	18.617	26.068	20.213	26.723	5.851	0.532	100.000
COUN/AD	13.514	18.040	10.053	8.882	8.595	1.613	9.905
OTHER	22	27	26	50	15	5	145
	15.172	18.621	17.931	34.483	10.345	3.448	100.000
	8.494	7.736	6.878	8.224	6.198	8.065	7.640
COLUMN SUMS	259	349	379	608	242	62	1898
	13.646	18.388	19.916	32.030	12.750	3.267	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-19 Years of Employment by Sex

ROWS = SEX COLUMNS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
MALE	145	195	211	402	188	50	1191
	12.175	16.373	17.716	33.753	15.785	4.198	100.000
	55.985	55.714	56.267	66.227	78.008	80.645	62.883
FEMALE	114	155	164	205	53	12	703
	16.216	22.048	23.329	29.161	7.539	1.707	100.000
	44.015	44.286	43.733	33.773	21.992	19.355	37.117
COLUMN SUMS	259	350	375	607	241	62	1894
	13.675	18.479	19.799	32.049	12.724	3.273	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-20 Years of Employment by Race

ROWS = RACE COLUMNS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
BLACK	17	29	27	43	11	4	131
	12.977	22.137	20.611	32.824	8.397	3.053	100.000
	6.564	8.309	7.124	7.072	4.508	6.349	6.887
NATIVE AMERICAN	1		1	5			7
	14.286		14.286	71.429			100.000
	0.386		0.264	0.822			0.368
ORIENTAL	1	6	7	2			16
	6.250	37.500	43.750	12.500			100.000
	0.386	1.719	1.847	0.329			0.841
SPANISH SURNAMED	5	4	15	10			34
	14.706	11.765	44.118	29.412			100.000
	1.931	1.146	3.958	1.645			1.788
WHITE	232	302	326	519	226	56	1681
	13.801	17.965	19.393	32.064	13.444	3.331	100.000
	89.575	86.533	86.016	88.651	92.623	88.889	88.381
OTHER	3	8	3	9	7	3	33
	9.091	24.242	9.091	27.273	21.212	9.091	100.000
	1.158	2.292	0.792	1.480	2.869	4.762	1.735
COLUMN SUMS	259	349	379	608	244	63	1902
	13.617	18.349	19.926	31.966	12.829	3.312	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-21 Highest Level of Education Achieved by Student Financial Aid Administrators

Approximately half of the respondents had a masters degree and 5.9 percent held the doctorate.

Table 1-21 Educational Level by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED

	DOCTORATE	MASTERS	BACHELORS	ASSOCIATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	74 5.593 69.688	725 52.046 75.916	381 27.351 69.399	59 4.235 76.623	150 10.768 75.000	1393 100.000 73.587
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	8 4.790 7.193	82 49.102 8.586	68 38.323 11.658	3 1.796 3.896	10 5.988 5.000	167 100.000 8.822
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	6 1.191 5.357	77 40.957 8.063	69 36.702 12.568	10 5.319 12.987	26 13.830 13.000	188 100.000 9.931
OTHER	20 11.793 17.857	71 38.966 7.435	35 20.138 6.375	5 3.448 6.494	14 9.655 7.000	145 100.000 7.660
COLUMN SUMS	112 5.917 100.000	955 50.449 100.000	549 29.002 100.000	77 4.068 100.000	200 10.565 100.000	1893 100.000 100.000

TABLE 1-22 Geographic Location by Title

Over 58 percent of the respondents were from either states comprising either EASFAA (28.3%) or MASFAA (29.9%). Respondents from SASFAA (15.5%) and SWASFAA (9.1%) represented just over one-fourth of the total. RMASFAA (4.7%) and WASFAA (12.4%) accounted for the remainder of the responses.

Table 1-22 Geographic Location by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

	EASFAA	SASFAA	MASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA	WASFAA	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	392	221	397	139	75	154	1378
TOR	28.447	16.038	28.810	10.087	5.443	11.176	100.000
	74.102	76.207	70.766	81.287	85.227	66.094	73.611
ASSOC.	46	17	68	10	8	21	162
ASSIS.	28.395	10.494	39.506	6.173	2.469	12.963	100.000
DIRECT.	8.696	5.862	11.408	5.848	9.545	9.013	8.654
FIN.AID	55	28	52	10	4	36	185
OFFICER	29.730	15.135	28.108	5.405	2.162	19.459	100.000
COUN/AD	10.397	9.655	9.269	5.848	4.545	15.451	9.882
OTHER	36	24	44	12	5	22	147
	24.490	16.327	32.653	8.163	3.401	14.966	100.000
	6.805	8.276	8.556	7.018	5.682	9.442	7.853
COLUMN	529	290	561	171	88	233	1872
SUMS	28.259	15.491	29.968	9.135	4.701	12.447	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-23 and 1-24 The Academic Level(s) of Students Served

Just over one-half of the respondents were employed in offices which only served undergraduate students. 38.5 percent were employed in offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students, and 9.7 worked in offices which only served graduate students.

As indicated in the narrative for Table 1-16, respondents employed in offices with graduate/professional clienteles were more likely to be less than full time than were respondents in other offices (significant at the .01 level).

Table 1-23 Academic Level of Students Served by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

	GR/PROF ONLY	UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	UNDGRS GR/PROF	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	95	782	517	1394
TOR	6.815	56.098	37.088	100.000
	51.630	79.715	70.919	73.601
ASSOC./	9	28	130	167
ASSIS.	5.389	16.766	77.844	100.000
DIRECT.	4.891	2.854	17.833	8.817
FIN.AID	38	99	50	187
OFFICER	20.321	52.941	26.738	100.000
COUN/AD	20.652	10.092	6.859	9.873
OTHER	42	72	32	146
	28.767	49.315	21.918	100.000
	22.826	7.339	4.390	7.709
COLUMN SUMS	184	981	729	1894
	9.715	51.795	38.490	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-24 Academic Level of Students Served by Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

	GR/PROF ONLY	UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	UNDGRG GR/PROF	ROW SUMS
100%	53	475	571	1099
	4.823	43.221	51.956	100.000
	28.649	48.272	78.112	57.842
75-99%	14	261	91	366
	3.825	71.311	24.863	100.000
	7.568	26.524	12.449	19.263
50-74%	24	127	36	187
	12.834	67.914	19.251	100.000
	12.973	12.907	4.925	9.842
LESS THAN HALF	94	121	33	248
	37.903	48.790	13.306	100.000
	50.811	12.297	4.514	13.053
COLUMN SUMS	185	984	731	1900
	9.737	51.789	38.474	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	101.000

TABLES 1-25 Through 1-27 Is Your Office Considered the Central Financial Aid Office on Campus?

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between whether or not respondents were employed in central financial aid offices by title, by kinds of students served, and by percentage of employment time spent in financial aid. Almost 93 percent of the respondents were employed in the central student financial aid office on their campus. Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors and those in the title category of "Other" were more likely to be employed in a non-central financial aid office than were Directors and Associate/Assistant Directors.

As shown in Table 1-26, respondents from offices serving only graduate/professional students were more likely to be employed in non-central offices than were other respondents. Furthermore, as the percentage of employment time spent in the financial aid office decreased, so did the likelihood that the respondent would work in a central financial aid office (Table 1-27).

Table 1-25 Central Financial Aid Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	1332	63	1395
	95.484	4.516	100.000
	75.639	47.015	73.615
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	160	7	167
	95.808	4.192	100.000
	9.086	5.224	8.813
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	165	22	187
	88.235	11.765	100.000
	9.370	16.418	9.868
OTHER	104	42	146
	71.233	28.767	100.000
	5.906	31.343	7.704
COLUMN SUMS	1761	134	1895
	92.929	7.071	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-26 Central Financial Aid Office by Kinds of Students Served

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

COLUMNS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	85 46.196 4.919	99 53.804 73.333	184 100.000 9.689
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	974 98.783 55.215	12 1.217 8.889	986 100.000 51.922
UNDGRS GR/PROF	705 96.708 39.966	24 3.292 17.778	729 100.000 38.389
COLUMN SUMS	1764 92.891 100.000	135 7.109 100.000	1899 100.000 100.000

Table 1-27 Central Financial Aid Office by Percentage of Employment Time in Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	1069 97.270 60.532	30 2.730 22.222	1099 100.000 57.812
75-99%	354 96.458 20.045	13 3.542 9.630	367 100.000 19.306
50-74%	169 90.374 9.570	18 9.626 13.333	187 100.000 9.837
LESS THAN HALF	174 70.161 9.853	74 29.839 54.815	248 100.000 13.046
COLUMN SUMS	1766 92.898 100.000	135 7.102 100.000	1901 100.000 100.000

TABLE 1-28 Through 1-32 Tenure

Approximately 83.6 percent of the respondents were not tenured. 4.8 percent of the respondents stated that they would be eligible for tenure in the future, while 16.4 percent of those completing the questionnaire currently had tenure.

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in the tenure status of respondents based upon percentage of employment time in financial aid, number of years in financial aid, and institutional control. As the percentage of employment time spent in financial aid decreased from 100 percent to under 50 percent, the likelihood that respondents had tenure almost doubled (Table 1-29). As might be expected, as years of employment in financial aid increased so too did the likelihood of having tenure (Table 1-30).

Respondents from public and proprietary institutions were more likely to report tenure than those from independent institutions.

There were no differences (at the .05 level) in whether respondents had tenure based upon sex or types of students served by the financial aid office.

Table 1-28 Tenure Status by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI-GIBLE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	215	56	1046	1317
TOR	16.325	4.252	79.423	100.000
	73.379	65.116	74.079	73.534
ASSOC./	12	9	140	161
ASSIS.	7.453	5.590	86.957	100.000
DIRECT.	4.096	10.465	9.915	8.989
FIN.AID	39	12	124	175
OFFICER	22.286	6.857	70.857	100.000
COUN/AD	13.311	13.953	8.782	9.771
OTHER	27	9	102	138
	19.565	6.522	73.913	100.000
	9.215	10.465	7.224	7.705
COLUMN SUMS	293	86	1412	1791
	16.360	4.802	78.839	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-29 Tenure Status by Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI-GIBLE	ROW SUMS
100%	135	41	872	1048
	12.882	3.912	83.206	100.000
	45.918	47.674	61.582	58.352
75-99%	69	22	259	350
	19.714	6.286	74.000	100.000
	23.469	25.581	18.291	19.488
50-74%	36	5	132	173
	20.809	2.890	76.301	100.000
	12.245	5.814	9.322	9.633
LESS THAN HALF	54	18	153	225
	24.000	8.000	68.000	100.000
	18.367	20.930	10.805	12.528
COLUMN SUMS	294	86	1416	1796
	16.370	4.788	78.842	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-30 Tenure Status by Years Worked in Financial Aid

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI-GIBLE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	23	21	189	233
	9.871	9.013	81.116	100.000
	7.823	24.419	13.376	12.995
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	44	12	271	327
	13.456	3.670	82.875	100.000
	14.966	13.953	19.179	18.238
4-5 YEARS	47	28	282	357
	13.165	7.843	78.992	100.000
	15.986	32.558	19.958	19.911
6-10 YEARS	115	19	444	578
	19.896	3.287	76.817	100.000
	39.116	22.093	31.423	32.236
11-15 YEARS	44	6	187	237
	18.565	2.532	78.903	100.000
	14.966	6.977	13.234	13.218
16+ YEARS	21		40	61
	34.426		65.574	100.000
	7.143		2.831	3.402
COLUMN SUMS	294	86	1413	1793
	16.397	4.796	78.806	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-31 Tenure Status by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI-GIBLE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	185	47	555	787
	23.507	5.972	70.521	100.000
	63.140	54.651	39.390	44.016
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	79	37	770	886
	8.916	4.176	86.907	100.000
	26.962	43.023	54.649	49.553
PROPRI-ETARY	29	2	84	115
	25.217	1.739	73.043	100.000
	9.898	2.326	5.962	6.432
COLUMN SUMS	293	86	1409	1788
	16.387	4.810	78.803	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-32 Tenure Status by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI-GIBLE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	94	32	417	543
	17.311	5.893	76.796	100.000
	32.082	37.647	29.595	30.386
1000-1999	67	23	443	533
	12.570	4.315	83.114	100.000
	22.867	27.059	31.441	29.827
4000-9999	64	18	226	308
	21.053	4.605	74.342	100.000
	21.843	16.471	16.040	17.012
10,000-19,999	38	14	180	232
	16.379	6.034	77.586	100.000
	12.969	16.471	12.775	12.983
20,000+	30	2	143	175
	17.143	1.143	81.714	100.000
	10.239	2.353	10.149	9.793
COLUMN SUMS	293	85	1409	1787
	16.396	4.757	78.847	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section B

Salaries of Student Financial Aid Administrators

TABLES 2-1 Through 2-9 Salaries*

In September, 1977, the median salary for 1,156 Directors of Financial Aid was approximately $16,250 (Table 2-1). Twenty-five percent of Directors earned salaries below $13,000, while one-fifth had salaries of $21,000 or over.

Salaries for other respondents such as Associate/Assistant Directors are based on a smaller sample, since the majority of NASFAA members in September, 1977, were Directors of Financial Aid. Therefore, the salaries for the other categories are less generalizable to the total population than are the salaries for Directors. The median salary for the 160 Associate/Assistant Directors was $14,700. The median salary for the 158 Financial Aid Advisors/Counselors/Officers was $13,870.

Respondents whose title fell into a category other than the above categories had a median annual salary of $15,200. However, the "other" category included individuals in a wide variety of positions from Student Services Coordinators to Deans of Students. This diversity of job classifications, and the fact that only 94 respondents were in the "other" category, limits the usefulness of the salary information in this category.

Institutional control and size are primary determinants of salary level. For example, Directors' salaries were significantly higher (at the .01 level) at public institutions than at either independent or proprietary institutions. Directors at public institutions had a median salary of $19,050 and over one-third of the Directors had salaries of $21,000 or over per year. The median salary for Directors at independent institutions was $14,430 and only 10.2 percent of the Directors had salaries of $21,000 or over. The median yearly salary for Directors of Financial Aid at proprietary institutions was the lowest of the three groups at $12,620 (Table 2-2).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in Directors' salaries based upon institutional size. For institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 students, median Directors' salaries were $12,560, while they were in excess of $23,180 at institutions with enrollments of 20,000 and over (Table 2-3).

Table 2-1 highlighted the median salary of approximately $16,250 for Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey. Table 2-3 identifies the fact that over 63 percent of the respondents were employed by institutions with enrollments of under 4,000 students and that Directors employed at these institutions had median salary levels below $16,250.

Previous tables have shown that there are differences in Directors' salaries by institutional type as well as by institutional size. Table 2-4 permits a detailed examination of the effects of both

---

*Respondents are included in tables displaying salaries or attitudes about salaries if they were employed full time and devoted at least 50 percent of their employment time to financial aid.

institutional type and size on Directors' salaries (institutional types with low numbers of respondents are not divided into size categories). For example, in the 84 public universities with an enrollment of under 7,000 students, the median Director's salary was $17,750. At the 53 institutions with enrollments of 20,000 or more, the median Director's salary was $24,580.

Salaries for other title categories by institutional type, control, and size are shown in Tables 2-5 and 2-6. Directors at public institutions with less than three years' experience have a median salary of $15,310, while the comparable figure for those have 3-5 years of experience is $17,670. Directors with six or more years of experience who are employed at public institutions have a median average salary of $20,370. The same tendency in Directors' salaries is noticeable at independent institutions as well as at proprietary institutions (Tables 2-7, 2-8, 2-9). To some extent, these differences are a result of the tendency for individuals to be employed at larger institutions as their length of employment in the financial aid profession increases.

Table 2-1 Salary by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000-12,999	$13,000-14,999	$15,000-16,999	$17,000-18,999	$19,000-20,999	$21,000-23,999	$24,000-26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	47	104	138	177	178	145	134	122	61	50	1156
	4.066	8.997	11.938	15.311	15.398	12.543	11.592	10.554	5.277	4.325	100.000
	65.278	65.409	63.594	73.750	75.105	71.429	81.212	85.315	85.915	81.967	73.724
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	5	24	28	27	29	[illegible]	14	8	4	1	160
	3.125	15.000	17.500	16.875	18.125	12.500	8.750	5.000	2.500	0.625	100.000
	6.944	15.094	12.903	11.250	12.236	9.852	8.485	5.594	5.634	1.639	10.204
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	15	22	32	23	20	21	13	6	3	3	158
	9.494	13.924	20.253	14.557	12.658	13.291	8.228	3.797	1.899	1.899	100.000
	20.833	13.836	18.747	9.583	8.439	10.345	7.879	4.196	4.225	4.918	10.077
OTHER	5	9	19	13	10	17	4	7	3	7	94
	5.319	9.574	20.213	13.830	10.638	18.085	4.255	7.447	3.191	7.447	100.000
	6.944	5.660	8.756	5.417	4.219	8.374	2.424	4.895	4.225	11.475	5.995
COLUMN SUMS	72	159	217	240	237	203	165	143	71	61	1568
	4.592	10.140	13.839	15.306	15.115	12.946	10.523	9.120	4.528	3.890	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-2 Salaries for Directors of Financial Aid by Institutional Control

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	5	11	12	49	79	81	80	86	42	33	478
	1.046	2.301	2.510	10.251	16.527	16.946	16.736	17.992	8.787	6.904	100.000
	10.870	10.577	8.696	27.841	44.886	55.862	59.701	71.074	68.852	67.347	41.565
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	30	74	105	112	86	59	53	33	15	11	578
	5.190	12.803	18.166	19.377	14.879	10.208	9.170	5.709	2.595	1.903	100.000
	65.217	71.154	76.087	63.636	48.864	40.690	39.552	27.273	24.590	22.449	50.261
PROPRIETARY	11	19	21	15	11	5	1	2	4	5	94
	11.702	20.213	22.340	15.957	11.702	5.319	1.064	2.128	4.255	5.319	100.000
	23.913	18.269	15.217	8.523	6.250	3.448	0.746	1.653	6.557	10.204	8.174
COLUMN SUMS	46	104	138	176	176	145	134	121	61	49	1150
	4.000	9.043	12.000	15.304	15.304	12.609	11.652	10.522	5.304	4.261	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-2A Salaries for Associate/Assistant Directors by Institutional Type

TITLE = ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	2	9	17	19	17	10	6	4		86
	2.326	2.326	10.465	19.767	22.093	19.767	11.628	6.977	4.651		100.000
	40.000	8.333	32.143	62.963	65.517	85.000	71.429	75.000	100.000		53.750
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	3	22	19	10	10	3	4	2		1	74
	4.054	29.730	25.676	13.514	13.514	4.054	5.405	2.703		1.351	100.000
	60.000	91.667	67.857	37.037	34.483	15.000	28.571	25.000		100.000	46.250
PROPRIETARY											
COLUMN SUMS	5	24	28	27	29	20	14	8	4	1	160
	3.125	15.000	17.500	16.875	18.125	12.500	8.750	5.000	2.500	0.625	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-2B Salaries for Financial Aid Officers, Counselors, Advisors by Institutional Type

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	3	6	14	13	14	18	7	4	3	3	85
	3.529	7.059	16.471	15.294	16.471	21.176	8.235	4.706	3.529	3.529	100.000
	20.000	27.273	43.750	56.522	70.000	85.714	53.846	66.667	100.000	100.000	53.797
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	9	9	15	10	5	3	6	2			59
	15.254	15.254	25.424	16.949	8.475	5.085	10.169	3.390			100.000
	60.000	40.909	46.875	43.478	25.000	14.286	46.154	33.333			37.342
PROPRIETARY	3	7	3		1						14
	21.429	50.000	21.429		7.143						100.000
	20.000	31.818	9.375		5.000						8.861
COLUMN SUMS	15	22	32	23	20	21	13	6	3	3	158
	9.494	13.924	20.253	14.557	12.658	13.291	8.228	3.797	1.899	1.899	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-3 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	40	77	68	63	39	25	12	10	5	1	340
	11.765	22.647	20.000	18.529	11.471	7.353	3.529	2.941	1.471	0.294	100.000
	85.106	74.038	49.635	35.593	22.159	17.241	9.023	8.264	8.197	2.000	29.540
1000-3999	7	23	61	88	85	52	42	18	4	8	388
	1.804	5.928	15.722	22.680	21.907	13.402	10.825	4.639	1.031	2.062	100.000
	14.894	22.115	44.526	49.718	48.295	35.862	31.579	14.876	6.557	16.000	33.710
4000-9999		2	7	17	41	42	42	39	17	9	216
		0.926	3.241	7.870	18.981	19.444	19.444	18.056	7.870	4.167	100.000
		1.923	5.109	9.605	23.295	28.966	31.579	32.231	27.869	18.000	18.766
10,000-19,999		2	1	7	7	16	24	43	20	13	133
		1.504	0.752	5.263	5.263	12.030	18.045	32.331	15.038	9.774	100.000
		1.923	0.730	3.955	3.977	11.034	18.045	35.537	32.787	26.000	11.555
20,000+				2	4	10	13	11	15	19	74
				2.703	5.405	13.514	17.568	14.865	20.270	25.676	100.000
				1.130	2.273	6.897	9.774	9.091	24.590	38.000	6.429
COLUMN SUMS	47	104	137	177	176	145	133	121	61	50	1151
	4.083	9.036	11.903	15.378	15.291	12.598	11.555	10.513	5.300	4.344	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-4 Salaries for Directors of Financial Aid by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		1	3	10	22	16	9	16	2	5	84
4 YEAR+		1.190	3.571	11.905	26.190	19.048	10.714	19.048	2.381	5.952	100.000
<7000		0.971	2.256	5.780	12.644	11.268	7.031	13.333	3.333	10.870	7.473
PUBLIC			1	1	6	20	19	34	11	4	96
4 YEAR+			1.042	1.042	6.250	20.833	19.792	35.417	11.458	4.167	100.000
7-19999			0.752	0.578	3.448	14.085	14.844	28.333	18.333	8.696	8.541
PUBLIC					2	6	7	9	13	16	53
4 YEAR+					3.774	11.321	13.208	16.981	24.528	30.189	100.000
20,000+					1.149	4.225	5.469	7.500	21.667	34.783	4.715
PUBLIC		2		8	12	5	3	1			31
4 YEAR		6.452		25.806	38.710	16.129	9.677	3.226			100.000
<4000		1.942		4.624	6.897	3.521	2.344	0.833			2.758
PUBLIC			1	6		5	5	4	2	1	24
4 YEAR			4.167	25.000		20.833	20.833	16.667	8.333	4.167	100.000
4,000+			0.752	3.468		3.521	3.906	3.333	3.333	2.174	2.135
PUBLIC	4	6	5	14	17	9	9	2	1	1	68
2 YEAR	5.882	8.824	7.353	20.588	25.000	13.235	13.235	2.941	1.471	1.471	100.000
<4000	8.889	5.825	3.759	8.092	9.770	6.338	7.031	1.667	1.667	2.174	6.050
PUBLIC				5	10	7	21	17	9	4	73
2 YEAR				6.849	13.699	9.589	28.767	23.288	12.329	5.479	100.000
4,000+				2.890	5.747	4.930	16.406	14.167	15.000	8.696	6.495
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF				3	3	2					8
				37.500	37.500	25.000					100.000
				1.734	1.724	1.408					0.712
INDEP	2	6	21	27	22	14	10	5	1		108
4 YEAR+	1.852	5.556	19.444	25.000	20.370	12.963	9.259	4.630	0.926		100.000
<4000	4.444	5.825	15.789	15.607	12.644	9.859	7.813	4.167	1.667		9.609
INDEP		1	2	6	13	14	14	11	12	10	83
4 YEAR+		1.205	2.410	7.229	15.663	16.867	16.867	13.253	14.458	12.048	100.000
4,000+		0.971	1.504	3.468	7.471	9.859	10.938	9.167	20.000	21.739	7.384
INDEP	13	41	26	26	14	7	2	2			131
4 YEAR	9.924	31.298	19.847	19.847	10.687	5.344	1.527	1.527			100.000
<1000	28.889	39.806	19.549	15.029	8.046	4.930	1.563	1.667			11.655
INDEP	3	11	31	28	17	14	9	4			117
4 YEAR	2.564	9.402	26.496	23.932	14.530	11.966	7.692	3.419			100.000
1-1,999	6.667	10.680	23.308	16.185	9.770	9.859	7.031	3.333			10.409
INDEP		2	1	7	9	4	10	4			37
4 YEAR		5.405	2.703	18.919	24.324	10.811	27.027	10.811			100.000
2,000+		1.942	0.752	4.046	5.172	2.817	7.813	3.333			3.292
INDEP	10	7	7	6	5	1	2	4			42
2 YEAR	23.810	16.667	16.667	14.286	11.905	2.381	4.762	9.524			100.000
	22.222	6.796	5.263	3.468	2.874	0.704	1.563	3.333			3.737
INDEP		2	8	6	4	3	3	2	1		29
GRAD/ PROF		6.897	27.586	20.690	13.793	10.345	10.345	6.897	3.448		100.000
		1.942	6.015	3.468	2.299	2.113	2.344	1.667	1.667		2.580
PUBLIC& INDEP NURSING		3		3	1	1	1	1	1		11
		27.273		27.273	9.091	9.091	9.091	9.091	9.091		100.000
		2.913		1.734	0.575	0.704	0.781	0.833	1.667		0.979
PUBLIC& INDEP VOC.TEC	2	2	2	6	2	6	9	3	2	3	35
	5.714	5.714	5.714	17.143	5.714	17.143	25.714	8.571	5.714	8.571	100.000
	4.444	1.942	4.511	1.156	3.448	6.338	2.344	1.667	5.000		3.114
PROPRI. VOC.TEC	6	11	11	12	4	4	1		3	5	59
	10.169	18.644	22.034	20.339	6.780	6.780	1.695		5.085	8.475	100.000
	13.333	10.680	9.774	6.936	2.299	2.817	0.781		5.000	10.870	5.249
ALL OTHER PROPRI.	5	8	8	3	7	1		2	1		35
	14.286	22.857	22.857	8.571	20.000	2.857		5.714	2.857		100.000
	11.111	7.767	6.015	1.734	4.023	0.704		1.667	1.667		3.114
COLUMN SUMS	45	103	133	173	174	142	128	120	60	46	1124
	4.004	9.164	11.833	15.391	15.480	12.633	11.388	10.676	5.338	4.093	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-5 Salaries for Associate/Assistant Directors of Financial Aid by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

TITLE = ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		1	1	2	2	1		2			9
4 YEAR+		11.111	11.111	22.222	22.222	11.111		22.222			100.000
<7000		4.348	3.846	7.407	7.143	5.000		25.000			5.769
PUBLIC			1	5	8	5	3	1			23
4 YEAR+			4.348	21.739	34.783	21.739	13.043	4.348			100.000
7-19999			3.846	18.519	28.571	25.000	21.429	12.500			14.744
PUBLIC			3	9	6	7	7	3	4		39
4 YEAR+			7.692	23.077	15.385	17.949	17.949	7.692	10.256		100.000
20,000+			11.538	33.333	21.429	35.000	50.000	37.500	100.000		25.000
PUBLIC			1	1							2
4 YEAR			50.000	50.000							100.000
<4000			3.846	3.704							1.282
PUBLIC					1	3					4
4 YEAR					25.000	75.000					100.000
4,300+					3.571	15.000					2.564
PUBLIC	1		1								2
2 YEAR	50.000		50.000								100.000
<4000	20.000		3.846								1.282
PUBLIC	1	1	1		1	1					5
2 YEAR	20.000	20.000	20.000		20.000	20.000					100.000
4,000+	20.000	4.348	3.846		3.571	5.000					3.205
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF											
INDEP	1	5	5	3	1						15
4 YEAR+	6.667	33.333	33.333	20.000	6.667						100.000
<4000	20.000	21.739	19.231	11.111	3.571						9.615
INDEP		2	7	6	8	2	3	2		1	31
4 YEAR+		6.452	22.581	19.355	25.806	6.452	9.677	6.452		3.226	100.000
4,000+		8.696	26.923	22.222	28.571	10.000	21.429	25.000		100.000	19.872
INDEP	1	5									6
4 YEAR	16.667	83.333									100.000
<1000	20.000	21.739									3.846
INDEP		3	1								4
4 YEAR		75.000	25.000								100.000
1-1,999		13.043	3.846								2.564
INDEP		4	3	1	1		1				10
4 YEAR		40.000	30.000	10.000	10.000		10.000				100.000
2,000+		17.391	11.538	3.704	3.571		7.143				6.410
INDEP	1										1
2 YEAR	100.000										100.000
	20.000										0.641
INDEP		2	2			1					5
GRAD/		40.000	40.000			20.000					100.000
PROF		8.696	7.692			5.000					3.205
PUBLIC& INDEP NURSING											
PUBLIC& INDEP VOC.TEC											
PROPRI. VOC.TEC											
ALL OTHER PROPRI.											
COLUMN SUMS	5	23	26	27	28	20	14	8	4	1	156
	3.205	14.744	16.667	17.308	17.949	12.821	8.974	5.128	2.564	0.641	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-6 Salaries for Financial Aid Officers, Counselors, Advisors by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	1				1		2				4
4 YEAR+	25.000				25.000		50.000				100.000
<7000	6.667				5.263		15.385				2.614
PUBLIC	1	1			2	2				1	7
4 YEAR+	14.286	14.286			28.571	28.571				14.286	100.000
7-19999	6.667	4.762			10.526	10.526				33.333	4.575
PUBLIC		1	4	4	3				1		13
4 YEAR+		7.692	30.769	30.769	23.077				7.692		100.000
20,000+		4.762	12.903	17.391	15.789				33.333		8.497
PUBLIC		1		1		2					4
4 YEAR		25.000		25.000		50.000					100.000
<4000		4.762		4.348		10.526					2.614
PUBLIC											
4 YEAR											
4,000+											
PUBLIC	1		2	4	3		2	1	1		14
2 YEAR	7.143		14.286	28.571	21.429		14.286	7.143	7.143		100.000
<4000	6.667		6.452	17.391	15.789		15.385	16.667	33.333		9.150
PUBLIC			2	3	2	7	3	1	1	2	21
2 YEAR			9.524	14.286	9.524	33.333	14.286	4.762	4.762	9.524	100.000
4,000+			6.452	13.043	10.526	36.842	23.077	16.667	33.333	66.667	13.725
PUBLIC,		1	3		1	2		1			8
GRAD/		12.500	37.500		12.500	25.000		12.500			100.000
PROF		4.762	9.677		5.263	10.526		16.667			5.229
INDEP	3		1	1	1	1	1	1			9
4 YEAR+	33.333		11.111	11.111	11.111	11.111	11.111	11.111			100.000
<4000	20.000		3.226	4.348	5.263	5.263	7.692	16.667			5.882
INDEP		1	3	1	1		1	1			8
4 YEAR+		12.500	37.500	12.500	12.500		12.500	12.500			100.000
4,000+		4.762	9.677	4.348	5.263		7.692	16.667			5.229
INDEP	2	4	1								7
4 YEAR	28.571	57.143	14.286								100.000
<1000	13.333	19.048	3.226								4.575
INDEP		1	3	2							6
4 YEAR		16.667	50.000	33.333							100.000
1-1,999		4.762	9.677	8.696							3.922
INDEP			2		1						3
4 YEAR			66.667		33.333						100.000
2,000+			6.452		5.263						1.961
INDEP	2		2	1							5
2 YEAR	40.000		40.000	20.000							100.000
	13.333		6.452	4.348							3.268
INDEP	2	2	1	5	2	2	4				18
GRAD/	11.111	11.111	5.556	27.778	11.111	11.111	22.222				100.000
PROF	13.333	9.524	3.226	21.739	10.526	10.526	30.769				11.765
PUBLIC&		1	1			1					3
INDEP		33.333	33.333			33.333					100.000
NURSING		4.762	3.226			5.263					1.961
PUBLIC&		1	3	1	1	2	1				9
INDEP		11.111	33.333	11.111	11.111	22.222	11.111				100.000
VOC.TEC		4.762	9.677	4.348	5.263	10.526	16.667				5.882
PROPRI.	3	3	2		1						9
VOC.TEC	33.333	33.333	22.222		11.111						100.000
	20.000	14.286	6.452		5.263						5.882
ALL		4	1								5
OTHER		80.000	20.000								100.000
PROPRI.		19.048	3.226								3.268
COLUMN SUMS	15	21	31	23	19	19	13	6	3	3	153
	9.804	13.725	20.261	15.033	12.418	12.418	8.497	3.922	1.961	1.961	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-7 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (3 Years or Less)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 3 YEARS OR LESS
FINANCIAL AID EXPER.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	5	7	24	19	9	9	3	1	3	82
	2.439	6.098	8.537	29.268	23.171	10.976	10.976	3.659	1.220	3.659	100.000
	7.407	7.937	9.211	31.169	52.778	45.000	69.231	50.000	25.000	75.000	25.153
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	19	42	59	46	13	9	4	3	3	1	199
	9.548	21.106	29.648	23.116	6.533	4.523	2.010	1.508	1.508	0.503	100.000
	70.370	66.667	77.632	59.740	36.111	45.000	30.769	50.000	75.000	25.000	61.043
PROPRIETARY	6	16	10	7	4	2					45
	13.333	35.556	22.222	15.556	8.889	4.444					100.000
	22.222	25.397	13.158	9.091	11.111	10.000					13.804
COLUMN SUMS	27	63	76	77	36	20	13	6	4	4	326
	8.282	19.325	23.313	23.620	11.043	6.135	3.988	1.840	1.227	1.227	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-8 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (4-5 Years)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 4-5
FINANCIAL AID YEARS

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	3	3	2	14	16	15	17	9	5	2	86
	3.488	3.488	2.326	16.279	18.605	17.442	19.767	10.465	5.814	2.325	100.000
	33.333	14.286	8.696	35.000	37.209	39.474	70.833	75.000	83.333	50.000	39.091
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	3	15	16	19	25	22	7	2	1		110
	2.727	13.636	14.545	17.273	22.727	20.000	6.364	1.818	0.909		100.000
	33.333	71.429	69.565	47.500	58.140	57.895	29.167	16.667	16.667		50.000
PROPRIETARY	3	3	5	7	2	1		1		2	24
	12.500	12.500	20.833	29.167	8.333	4.167		4.167		8.333	100.000
	33.333	14.286	21.739	17.500	4.651	2.632		8.333		50.000	10.909
COLUMN SUMS	9	21	23	40	43	38	24	12	6	4	220
	4.091	9.545	10.455	18.182	19.545	17.273	10.909	5.455	2.727	1.818	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-9 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (6+ Years)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 6+
FINANCIAL AID YEARS

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		3	3	11	44	57	54	74	36	28	310
		0.968	0.968	3.548	14.194	18.387	17.419	23.871	11.613	9.032	100.000
		15.000	7.692	18.644	45.833	65.517	55.670	71.845	70.588	68.293	51.410
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	8	17	30	47	47	28	42	28	11	10	268
	2.985	6.343	11.194	17.537	17.537	10.448	15.672	10.448	4.104	3.731	100.000
	80.000	85.000	76.923	79.661	48.958	32.184	43.299	27.184	21.569	24.390	44.444
PROPRIETARY	2		6	1	5	2	1	1	4	3	25
	8.000		24.000	4.000	20.000	8.000	4.000	4.000	16.000	12.000	100.000
	20.000		15.385	1.695	5.208	2.299	1.031	0.971	7.843	7.317	4.146
COLUMN SUMS	10	20	39	59	96	87	97	103	51	41	603
	1.658	3.317	6.468	9.784	15.920	14.428	16.086	17.081	8.458	6.799	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section C

Attitudes of Student Financial
Aid Administrators

TABLES 3-1 Through 3-10 "In Comparison to the Salaries in Other Institutions and to Salaries of Individuals Not Employed in Education, my Salary is Adequate"

Less than half of the respondents stated that their salaries were not adequate compared to salaries at other educational institutions and to the salaries of those not employed in education. Only 12.1 percent of the respondents expressed strong agreement with the adequacy of their salary compared to the salaries of individuals not employed at their institution (Table 3-1). Associate/Assistant Directors tended to express more dissatisfaction with their salaries than did respondents in other categories.

In general, respondents in all title categories tended to express more satisfaction with their salaries at public institutions than at private institutions. Among Directors of Financial Aid, respondents from proprietary institutions expressed the highest levels of satisfaction (Table 3-2). Responses from other title categories are shown in Tables 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5.

Respondents in all title categories were more likely to strongly agree that their salary was adequate as institutional size increased (Tables 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9).

Table 3-10 displays Directors' reactions to the adequacy of salary by institutional type, size, and control. Due to the limited number of respondents in the other title categories, responses of individuals who were not directors are not shown by institutional type, size, and control.

Table 3-1 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	137	383	350	252	1122
	12.210	34.135	31.194	22.460	100.000
	74.054	77.688	72.464	69.231	73.574
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	16	41	83	57	197
	10.191	26.115	27.389	36.306	100.000
	8.649	8.316	8.903	15.659	10.295
FIN.AID OFFICER/ COUN/AD	17	44	58	18	153
	11.111	28.758	37.908	22.222	100.000
	9.189	8.925	12.008	9.341	10.033
OTHER	15	25	32	21	93
	16.129	26.882	34.409	22.581	100.000
	8.108	5.071	6.625	5.769	6.098
COLUMN SUMS	185	493	483	368	1525
	12.131	32.328	31.672	23.869	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-2 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Directors)

TITLE = DIREC-TOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	71	169	124	108	472
	15.042	35.805	26.271	22.881	100.000
	51.825	44.591	35.429	43.200	42.294
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	47	173	204	130	554
	8.484	31.227	36.823	23.466	100.000
	34.307	45.646	58.286	52.000	49.642
PROPRIETARY	19	37	22	12	90
	21.111	41.111	24.444	13.333	100.000
	13.869	9.763	6.286	4.800	8.065
COLUMN SUMS	137	379	350	250	1116
	12.276	33.961	31.362	22.401	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-3 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Associate/Assistant Directors)

TITLE = ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	11	23	23	27	84
	13.095	27.381	27.381	32.143	100.000
	68.750	56.098	53.488	47.368	53.503
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	5	18	20	30	73
	6.849	24.658	27.397	41.096	100.000
	31.250	43.902	46.512	52.632	46.497
PROPRIETARY					
COLUMN SUMS	16	41	43	57	157
	10.191	26.115	27.389	36.306	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-4 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	12	22	30	19	83
	14.458	26.506	36.145	22.892	100.000
	70.588	50.000	51.724	55.882	54.248
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	5	18	21	12	56
	8.929	32.143	37.500	21.429	100.000
	29.412	40.909	36.207	35.294	36.601
PROPRIETARY		4	7	3	14
		28.571	50.000	21.429	100.000
		9.091	12.069	8.824	9.150
COLUMN SUMS	17	44	58	34	153
	11.111	28.758	37.908	22.222	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-5 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	14	16	19	10	59
	23.729	27.119	32.203	16.949	100.000
	93.333	64.000	61.290	47.619	64.130
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	1	8	12	11	32
	3.125	25.000	37.500	34.375	100.000
	6.667	32.000	38.710	52.381	34.783
PROPRIETARY		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		4.000			1.087
COLUMN SUMS	15	25	31	21	92
	16.304	27.174	33.696	22.826	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-6 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	32	101	119	75	327
	9.786	30.887	36.391	22.936	100.000
	23.529	26.509	34.097	29.880	29.275
1000-3999	37	122	117	97	373
	9.920	32.708	31.367	26.005	100.000
	27.206	32.021	33.524	38.645	33.393
4000-9999	36	67	63	45	211
	17.062	31.754	29.858	21.327	100.000
	26.471	17.585	18.052	17.928	18.890
10,000-19,999	19	56	35	22	132
	14.394	42.424	26.515	16.667	100.000
	13.971	14.698	10.029	8.765	11.817
20,000+	12	35	15	12	74
	16.216	47.297	20.270	16.216	100.000
	8.824	9.186	4.298	4.781	6.625
COLUMN SUMS	136	381	349	251	1117
	12.175	34.109	31.244	22.471	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-7 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Size (Associate/Assistant Directors)

TITLE = ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	1	4	4	6	15
	6.667	26.667	26.667	40.000	100.000
	6.250	9.756	9.524	10.714	9.677
1000-1999	1	6	6	14	27
	3.704	22.222	22.222	51.852	100.000
	6.250	14.634	14.286	25.000	17.419
4000-9999	3	7	11	13	34
	8.824	20.588	32.353	38.235	100.000
	18.750	17.073	26.190	23.214	21.935
10,000-19,999	8	12	7	9	32
	12.500	37.500	21.875	28.125	100.000
	25.000	29.268	16.667	16.071	20.645
20,000+	7	12	14	14	47
	14.894	25.532	29.787	29.787	100.000
	43.750	29.268	33.333	25.000	30.323
COLUMN SUMS	16	41	42	56	155
	10.323	26.452	27.097	36.129	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-8 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Size (Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	3	8	14	14	39
	7.692	20.513	35.897	35.897	100.000
	17.647	18.182	24.138	41.176	25.490
1000-1999	4	15	22	9	50
	8.000	30.000	44.000	18.000	100.000
	23.529	34.091	37.931	26.471	32.680
4000-9999	2	8	8	2	20
	10.000	40.000	40.000	10.000	100.000
	11.765	18.182	13.793	5.882	13.072
10,000-19,999	4	8	8	5	25
	16.000	32.000	32.000	20.000	100.000
	23.529	18.182	13.793	14.706	16.340
20,000+	4	5	6	4	19
	21.053	26.316	31.579	21.053	100.000
	23.529	11.364	10.345	11.765	12.418
COLUMN SUMS	17	44	58	34	153
	11.111	28.758	37.908	22.222	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-9 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Size (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	1	2	4	6	13
	7.692	15.385	30.769	46.154	100.000
	6.667	8.000	12.903	28.571	14.130
1000-1999	2	10	12	6	30
	6.667	33.333	40.000	20.000	100.000
	13.333	40.000	38.710	28.571	32.609
4000-9999		1	6	6	13
		7.692	46.154	46.154	100.000
		4.000	19.355	28.571	14.130
10,000-19,999	7	5	6	1	19
	36.842	26.316	31.579	5.263	100.000
	46.667	20.000	19.355	4.762	20.652
20,000+	5	7	3	2	17
	29.412	41.176	17.647	11.765	100.000
	33.333	28.000	9.677	9.524	18.478
COLUMN SUMS	15	25	31	21	92
	16.304	27.174	33.696	22.826	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-10 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Type, Control, and Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	15	25	22	22	84
4 YEAR+	17.857	29.762	26.190	26.190	100.000
<7000	11.278	6.739	6.033	9.016	7.706
PUBLIC	15	35	27	18	95
4 YEAR+	15.789	36.842	28.421	18.947	100.000
7-19999	11.278	9.438	7.895	7.377	8.716
PUBLIC	10	26	10	7	53
4 YEAR+	18.868	49.057	18.868	13.208	100.000
20,000+	7.519	7.008	2.928	2.869	4.862
PUBLIC	2	7	11	9	29
4 YEAR	6.897	24.138	37.931	31.034	100.000
<4000	1.504	1.887	3.216	3.689	2.661
PUBLIC	4	6	8	6	24
4 YEAR	16.667	25.000	33.333	25.000	100.000
4,000+	3.008	1.617	2.339	2.459	2.202
PUBLIC	8	21	21	20	66
2 YEAR	6.061	31.818	31.818	30.303	100.000
<4000	3.008	5.660	6.140	8.197	6.055
PUBLIC	14	32	13	13	72
2 YEAR	19.444	48.448	18.056	18.056	100.000
4,000+	10.526	8.625	3.801	5.328	6.606
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF		4	1	3	8
		50.000	12.500	37.500	100.000
		1.078	0.292	1.230	0.734
INDEP	7	33	38	26	104
4 YEAR+	6.731	31.731	36.538	25.000	100.000
<4000	5.263	8.895	11.111	10.656	9.541
INDEP	12	29	23	16	80
4 YEAR+	15.000	36.250	28.750	20.000	100.000
4,000+	9.023	7.817	6.725	6.557	7.339
INDEP	4	33	61	26	124
4 YEAR	3.226	26.613	49.194	20.968	100.000
<1000	3.008	8.895	17.836	10.656	11.376
INDEP	6	33	39	35	113
4 YEAR	5.310	29.204	34.513	30.973	100.000
1-1,999	4.511	8.895	11.404	14.344	10.367
INDEP	4	12	15	6	37
4 YEAR	10.811	32.432	40.541	16.216	100.000
2,000+	3.008	3.235	4.386	2.459	3.394
INDEP	5	12	13	11	41
2 YEAR	12.195	29.268	31.707	26.829	100.000
	3.759	3.235	3.801	4.508	3.761
INDEP	2	12	4	7	25
GRAD/	8.000	48.000	16.000	28.000	100.000
PROF	1.504	3.235	1.170	2.869	2.294
PUBLIC&	4	5	2		11
INDEP	36.364	45.455	18.182		100.000
NURSING	3.008	1.348	0.585		1.009
PUBLIC&	6	9	12	7	34
INDEP	17.647	26.471	35.294	20.588	100.000
VOC.TEC	4.511	2.426	3.509	2.869	3.119
PROPRI.	17	23	10	7	57
VOC.TEC	29.825	40.351	17.544	12.281	100.000
	12.782	6.199	2.924	2.869	5.229
ALL OTHER	2	14	12	5	33
PROPRI.	6.061	42.424	36.364	15.152	100.000
	1.504	3.774	3.509	2.049	3.028
COLUMN SUMS	133	371	342	248	1090
	12.202	34.037	31.376	22.385	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 3-11 Through 3-20 "In Comparison to the Salaries of Others in my Institution, my Salary is Adequate"

As shown in Table 3-11, respondents were more likely to agree that their salaries were adequate compared to salaries within their institution (55.0%) as opposed to salaries outside of their institution (44.5%) as shown in Table 3-1. As in Table 3-1, Associate/Assistant Directors expressed a higher level of dissatisfaction with their salaries than did other respondents.

There was a slight tendency for respondents from independent institutions to agree more readily than those from public institutions that their salary was adequate compared with others in their institution. Directors of Financial Aid at proprietary institutions expressed the greatest level of satisfaction, with approximately two-thirds of them agreeing that their salary was adequate (Table 3-2; also see Tables 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, and 3-15).

There were no differences (at the .05 level) between satisfaction with salary and institutional size within each title category. This is not to say, however, that there are no differences based upon size (Tables 3-16, 3-17, 3-18, and 3-19).

Table 3-20 shows Directors' reactions to the adequacy of salary by institutional type, size, and control.

Table 3-11 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Title

ROWS = TITLE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	220	429	313	162	1124
	19.573	38.167	27.847	14.413	100.000
	78.853	76.335	71.298	65.323	73.560
ASSOC./ASSTS. DIRECT.	19	49	50	40	157
	12.102	30.573	31.847	25.478	100.000
	6.810	8.541	11.390	16.129	10.275
FIN.AID OFFICER	21	58	49	26	154
	13.636	37.662	31.818	16.883	100.000
COUN/AD	7.527	10.320	11.162	10.484	10.079
OTHER	19	27	27	20	93
	20.430	29.032	29.032	21.505	100.000
	6.810	4.804	6.150	8.065	6.086
COLUMN SUMS	279	562	439	248	1528
	18.259	36.780	28.730	16.230	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-12 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Directors)

TITLE = DIREC-
TOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	85	163	136	89	473
	17.970	34.461	28.753	18.816	100.000
	38.813	38.353	43.590	54.938	42.308
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	107	230	156	63	556
	19.245	41.367	28.058	11.331	100.000
	48.858	54.118	50.000	38.889	49.732
PROPRI-ETARY	27	32	20	10	89
	30.337	35.955	22.472	11.236	100.000
	12.329	7.529	6.410	6.173	7.961
COLUMN SUMS	219	425	312	162	1118
	19.589	38.014	27.907	14.490	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-13 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Associate/Assistant Directors)

ASSOC./
TITLE = ASSIS.
DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	11	23	26	24	84
	11.095	27.381	30.952	28.571	100.000
	57.895	47.917	52.000	60.000	53.503
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	8	25	24	16	73
	10.959	34.247	32.877	21.918	100.000
	42.105	52.083	48.000	40.000	46.497
PROPRI-ETARY					
COLUMN SUMS	19	48	50	40	157
	12.102	30.573	31.847	25.478	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-14 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Financial Aid Officers/ Counselors/Advisors)

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	9	27	29	20	85
	10.588	31.765	34.118	23.529	100.000
	42.857	46.552	59.184	76.923	55.195
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	11	25	15	5	56
	19.643	44.643	26.786	8.929	100.000
	52.381	43.103	30.612	19.231	36.364
PROPRI-ETARY	1	6	5	1	13
	7.692	46.154	38.462	7.692	100.000
	4.762	10.345	10.204	3.846	8.442
COLUMN SUMS	21	58	49	26	154
	13.636	37.662	31.818	16.883	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-15 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	13	12	22	13	60
	21.667	20.000	36.667	21.667	100.000
	68.421	44.444	84.615	65.000	65.217
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	6	14	4	7	31
	19.355	45.161	12.903	22.581	100.000
	31.579	51.852	15.385	35.000	33.696
PROPRI-ETARY		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		3.704			1.087
COLUMN SUMS	19	27	26	20	92
	20.652	29.348	28.261	21.739	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-16 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIREC-TOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	75	124	90	39	328
	22.866	37.805	27.439	11.890	100.000
	34.247	29.176	28.754	24.074	29.312
1000-3999	60	144	112	60	376
	15.957	38.298	29.787	15.957	100.000
	27.397	33.882	35.783	37.037	33.601
4000-9999	42	74	56	38	210
	20.000	35.238	26.667	18.095	100.000
	19.178	17.412	17.891	23.457	18.767
10,000-19,999	27	57	31	16	131
	20.611	43.511	23.664	12.214	100.000
	12.329	13.412	9.904	9.877	11.707
20,000+	15	26	28	9	78
	20.270	35.135	32.432	12.162	100.000
	6.849	6.118	7.668	5.556	6.613
COLUMN SUMS	219	425	313	162	1119
	19.571	37.980	27.971	14.477	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-17 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Size (Associate/Assistant Directors)

TITLE = ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	2	6	6	1	15
	13.333	40.000	40.000	6.667	100.000
	10.526	12.766	12.000	2.564	9.677
1000-3999	4	6	6	11	27
	14.815	22.222	22.222	40.741	100.000
	21.053	12.766	12.000	28.205	17.419
4000-9999	2	11	16	5	34
	5.882	32.353	47.059	14.706	100.000
	10.526	23.404	32.000	12.821	21.935
10,000-19,999	5	12	6	9	32
	15.625	37.500	18.750	28.125	100.000
	26.316	25.532	12.000	23.077	20.645
20,000+	6	12	16	13	47
	12.766	25.532	34.043	27.660	100.000
	31.579	25.532	32.000	33.333	30.323
COLUMN SUMS	19	47	50	39	155
	12.258	30.323	32.258	25.161	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-18 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Size (Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

TITLE = FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	6	15	10	7	38
	15.789	39.474	26.316	18.421	100.000
	28.571	25.862	20.833	26.923	24.837
1000-3999	4	22	17	8	51
	7.843	43.137	33.333	15.686	100.000
	19.048	37.931	35.417	30.769	33.333
4000-9999	2	9	7	2	20
	10.000	45.000	35.000	10.000	100.000
	9.524	15.517	14.583	7.692	13.072
10,000-19,999	5	5	8	7	25
	20.000	20.000	32.000	28.000	100.000
	23.810	8.621	16.667	26.923	16.340
20,000+	4	7	6	2	19
	21.053	36.842	31.579	10.526	100.000
	19.048	12.069	12.500	7.692	12.418
COLUMN SUMS	21	58	48	26	153
	13.725	37.908	31.373	16.993	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-19 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Size (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	3	4	1	5	13
	23.077	30.769	7.692	38.462	100.000
	15.789	14.815	3.846	25.000	14.130
1000-3999	6	9	9	7	31
	19.355	29.032	29.032	22.581	100.000
	31.579	33.333	34.615	35.000	33.696
4000-9999		6	4	3	13
		46.154	30.769	23.077	100.000
		22.222	15.385	15.000	14.130
10,000-19,999	6	4	7	1	18
	33.333	22.222	38.889	5.556	100.000
	31.579	14.815	26.923	5.000	19.565
20,000+	4	4	5	4	17
	23.529	23.529	29.412	23.529	100.000
	21.053	14.815	19.231	20.000	18.478
COLUMN SUMS	19	27	26	20	92
	20.652	29.348	28.261	21.739	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-20 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Type, Control, and Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE	COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION? STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	18	28	21	17	84
4 YEAR+	21.429	33.333	25.000	20.238	100.000
<7000	8.531	6.731	6.840	10.625	7.678
PUBLIC	17	34	28	16	95
4 YEAR+	17.895	35.789	29.474	16.842	100.000
7-19999	8.057	8.173	9.121	10.000	8.684
PUBLIC	11	21	14	7	53
4 YEAR+	20.755	39.623	26.415	13.208	100.000
20,000+	5.213	5.048	4.560	4.375	4.845
PUBLIC	2	6	13	9	30
4 YEAR	6.667	20.000	43.333	30.000	100.000
<4000	0.948	1.442	4.235	5.625	2.742
PUBLIC	4	8	8	4	24
4 YEAR	16.667	33.333	33.333	16.667	100.000
4,000+	1.896	1.923	2.606	2.500	2.194
PUBLIC	9	25	17	18	68
2 YEAR	11.765	36.765	25.000	26.471	100.000
<4000	3.791	6.010	5.537	11.250	6.216
PUBLIC	17	21	21	12	71
2 YEAR	23.944	29.577	29.577	16.901	100.000
4,000+	8.057	5.048	6.840	7.500	6.490
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF		2	4	2	8
		25.000	50.000	25.000	100.000
		0.481	1.303	1.250	0.731
INDEP	18	50	23	14	105
4 YEAR+	17.143	47.619	21.905	13.333	100.000
<4000	8.531	12.019	7.492	8.750	9.598
INDEP	17	36	19	8	80
4 YEAR+	21.250	45.000	23.750	10.000	100.000
4,000+	8.057	8.654	6.189	5.000	7.313
INDEP	26	45	39	14	124
4 YEAR	20.968	36.290	31.452	11.290	100.000
<1000	12.322	10.817	12.704	8.750	11.335
INDEP	13	44	41	16	114
4 YEAR	11.404	38.596	35.965	14.035	100.000
1-1,999	6.161	10.577	13.355	10.000	10.420
INDEP	7	17	10	3	37
4 YEAR	18.919	45.946	27.027	8.108	100.000
2,000+	3.318	4.087	3.257	1.875	3.382
INDEP	9	14	14	4	41
2 YEAR	21.951	34.146	34.146	9.756	100.000
	4.265	3.365	4.560	2.500	3.748
INDEP	8	11	3	4	26
GRAD/	30.769	42.308	11.538	15.385	100.000
PROF	3.791	2.644	0.977	2.500	2.377
PUBLIC& INDEP	3	6	2		11
	27.273	54.545	18.182		100.000
NURSING	1.422	1.442	0.651		1.005
PUBLIC& INDEP	6	16	10	2	34
	17.647	47.059	29.412	5.882	100.000
VOC.TEC	2.844	3.846	3.257	1.250	3.108
PROPRI. VOC.TEC	19	15	15	6	55
	34.545	27.273	27.273	10.909	100.000
	9.005	3.606	4.886	3.750	5.027
ALL OTHER PROPRI.	8	17	5	4	34
	23.529	50.000	14.706	11.765	100.000
	3.791	4.087	1.629	2.500	3.108
COLUMN SUMS	211	416	307	160	1094
	19.287	38.026	28.062	14.625	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 4-1 Through 4-4 "I Have Enough Authority to do my Job Effectively"

Over 93 percent of the respondents agreed, either strongly or moderately, that they had enough authority to do their job effectively. Directors of financial aid were most likely to express "strong" agreement that they had enough authority to do their job effectively (Table 4-1).

At least 90 percent of the respondents in most of the major categories agreed that they had sufficient authority. However, there are a number of statistically significant differences (at the .01 level) based upon institutional control, size, and "number of years of employment in the financial aid profession." For example, 71.3 percent of the respondents from proprietary institutions expressed strong agreement that they had sufficient authority, while the percentage expressing strong agreement from public institutions was considerably less (Table 4-2). As shown in Table 4-3, the percentage of respondents expressing strong agreement that they have sufficient authority decreases from 63.5 percent to 51.4 percent as institutional size increases from under 1,000 to over 20,000.

As length of employment increases, the tendency for respondents to strongly agree that they have sufficient authority also increases (Table 4-4).

Table 4-1 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	867 62.464 73.747	460 33.141 69.697	45 3.242 52.941	16 1.153 40.000	1388 100.000 73.595
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	73 43.976 6.640	69 41.566 10.455	14 8.434 16.471	10 6.024 25.000	166 100.000 8.802
FIN.AID OFFICER/ COUN/ADV	85 45.699 7.720	79 42.473 11.970	13 7.527 16.471	8 4.301 20.000	186 100.000 9.862
OTHER	76 52.055 6.903	52 35.616 7.879	12 8.219 14.118	6 4.110 15.000	146 100.000 7.741
COLUMN SUMS	1101 58.378 100.000	660 34.995 100.000	85 4.507 100.000	40 2.121 100.000	1886 100.000 100.000

Table 4-2 Sufficient Authority to Do Job Effectively by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	435	296	45	22	798
	54.511	37.093	5.639	2.757	100.000
	39.617	44.848	52.326	55.000	42.357
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	556	325	38	17	936
	59.402	34.722	4.060	1.816	100.000
	50.638	49.242	44.186	42.500	49.682
PROPRI-ETARY	107	39	3	1	150
	71.333	26.000	2.000	0.667	100.000
	9.745	5.909	3.488	2.500	7.962
COLUMN SUMS	1098	660	86	40	1884
	58.280	35.032	4.565	2.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-3 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	388	195	20	8	611
	61.502	31.915	3.273	1.309	100.000
	35.273	29.635	23.256	20.000	32.431
1000-1999	333	186	29	8	556
	59.892	33.453	5.216	1.439	100.000
	30.273	28.267	33.721	20.000	29.512
4000-9999	166	118	16	6	306
	54.248	38.562	5.229	1.961	100.000
	15.091	17.933	18.605	15.000	16.242
10,000-19,999	123	91	11	10	235
	52.340	38.723	4.681	4.255	100.000
	11.182	13.830	12.791	25.000	12.473
20,000+	90	68	10	8	176
	51.136	38.636	5.682	4.545	100.000
	8.182	10.334	11.628	20.000	9.342
COLUMN SUMS	1100	658	86	40	1884
	58.386	34.926	4.565	2.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-4 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	128 49.612 11.615	113 43.798 17.121	13 5.039 15.116	4 1.550 10.000	258 100.000 13.665
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	176 50.867 15.971	139 40.173 21.061	21 6.069 24.419	10 2.890 25.000	346 100.000 18.326
4-5 YEARS	223 59.626 20.236	128 34.225 19.394	10 2.674 11.628	13 3.476 32.500	374 100.000 19.809
6-10 YEARS	360 59.406 32.668	204 33.663 30.909	31 5.116 36.047	11 1.815 27.500	606 100.000 32.097
11-15 YEARS	171 70.954 15.517	60 24.896 9.091	8 3.320 9.302	2 0.830 5.000	241 100.000 12.765
16+ YEARS	44 69.841 3.993	16 25.397 2.424	3 4.762 3.488		63 100.000 3.337
COLUMN SUMS	1102 58.369 100.000	660 34.958 100.000	86 4.555 100.000	40 2.119 100.000	1888 100.000 100.000

TABLES 4-5 Through 4-7 "My Superiors Have a Clear Picture of the Kind of Job I am Doing in Financial Aid Administration"

78.3 percent of the respondents regarded their superiors as having a clear picture of the kind of work they were doing in the financial aid office. However, there are significant differences (at the .05 level) between various categories of respondents. The categories of "Associate/Assistant Director" and "Financial Aid Officer/Counselor/Advisor" had the highest levels of dissatisfaction with their superiors' knowledge of the kind of job they were doing (Table 4-5).

Reactions to superiors' knowledge of the kind of job being done by respondents varied by institutional type and size (Table 4-6). The respondents who most strongly agreed that their superiors had a clear picture of the kind of work being done by the respondent were from independent universities with enrollments of over 4,000 students and from proprietary institutions. Respondents from the following types of institutions had the greatest tendency to disagree (either strongly or moderately) that their superiors had a clear picture of the work being done by the respondents:

1. 2-year public colleges with enrollments of 4,000 and over (32.5%)

2. 4-year independent colleges with enrollments of 2,000 and over (32.7%)

3. Nursing Schools (40.0%)

There is a statistically significant relationship (at the .01 level) between greater understanding of the respondents' performance by superiors and longer length of employment in the financial aid profession. For example, for those with 5 or less years of experience, less than one-third strongly agree that their supervisors understand the kind of work being done by the respondent. For those employed in financial aid 11-15 years, the figure moves up to 43.1 percent and for those employed 16 years or more the figure equals 50 percent (Table 4-7).

Table 4-5 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of Job Done by Title

ROW: TITLE	COLUMNS = SUPERIORS UNDERSTAND PERFORMANCE?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	867	621	185	89	1382
TOR	62.735	44.935	13.386	6.440	100.000
	75.021	74.910	69.811	62.239	73.472
ASSOC./	54	58	27	22	166
ASSIS.	32.530	34.940	16.265	13.253	100.000
DIRECT.	4.761	6.996	10.189	15.385	8.825
FIN.AID	58	82	32	21	188
OFFICER	30.851	43.617	17.021	11.170	100.000
COUNSOR	5.019	9.891	12.075	14.685	9.995
OTHER	45	68	21	11	145
	31.034	46.897	14.483	7.586	100.000
	3.968	8.293	7.925	7.692	7.709
COLUMN SUMS	644	829	265	143	1881
	34.237	44.072	14.088	7.602	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-6 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of Job Done by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE	COLUMNS = SUPERIORS UNDERSTAND PERFORMANCE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	35	48	15	9	107
4 YEAR+	32.710	44.860	14.019	8.411	100.000
<7000	5.654	5.941	5.725	6.383	5.847
PUBLIC	43	63	20	11	137
4 YEAR+	31.387	45.985	14.599	8.029	100.000
7-19999	6.947	7.797	7.634	7.801	7.486
PUBLIC	40	57	13	9	119
4 YEAR+	33.613	47.899	10.924	7.563	100.000
20,000+	6.462	7.054	4.962	6.383	6.503
PUBLIC	14	15	8	3	40
4 YEAR	35.000	37.500	20.000	7.500	100.000
<4000	2.262	1.856	3.053	2.128	2.186
PUBLIC	10	12	4	3	29
4 YEAR	34.483	41.379	13.793	10.345	100.000
4,000+	1.616	1.485	1.527	2.128	1.585
PUBLIC	36	54	20	9	119
2 YEAR	30.252	45.378	16.807	7.563	100.000
<4000	5.816	6.683	7.634	6.383	6.503
PUBLIC	28	53	23	16	120
2 YEAR	23.333	44.167	19.167	13.333	100.000
4,000+	4.523	6.559	8.779	11.348	6.557
PUBLIC,	12	17	4	3	36
GRAD/	33.333	47.222	11.111	8.333	100.000
PROF	1.939	2.104	1.527	2.128	1.967
INDEP	50	84	17	11	162
4 YEAR+	30.864	51.852	10.496	6.790	100.000
<4000	8.078	10.396	6.489	7.801	8.852
INDEP	68	51	21	9	149
4 YEAR+	45.638	34.228	14.094	6.040	100.000
4,000+	10.985	6.312	8.015	6.383	8.142
INDEP	53	90	27	13	183
4 YEAR	28.962	49.180	14.754	7.104	100.000
<1000	8.562	11.139	10.305	9.220	10.000
INDEP	46	66	19	9	140
4 YEAR	32.857	47.143	13.571	6.429	100.000
1-1,999	7.431	8.168	7.252	6.383	7.650
INDEP	16	21	12	6	55
4 YEAR	29.091	38.182	21.818	10.909	100.000
2,000+	2.585	2.599	4.580	4.255	3.005
INDEP	27	33	8	5	73
2 YEAR	36.986	45.205	10.959	6.849	100.000
	4.362	4.084	3.053	3.546	3.989
INDEP	42	43	11	9	107
GRAD/	39.252	40.187	12.150	8.411	100.000
PROF	6.785	5.322	4.962	6.383	5.847
PUBLIC&	8	13	11	3	35
INDEP	22.857	37.143	31.429	8.571	100.000
NURSING	1.292	1.609	4.198	2.128	1.913
PUBLIC&	20	37	11	6	74
INDEP	27.027	50.000	14.865	8.108	100.000
VOC.TEC	3.231	4.579	4.198	4.255	4.044
PROPRI.	47	26	8	6	87
VOC.TEC	54.023	29.885	9.195	6.897	100.000
	7.593	3.218	3.053	4.255	4.754
ALL	24	25	8	1	58
OTHER	41.379	43.103	13.793	1.724	100.000
PROPRI.	3.877	3.094	3.053	0.709	3.169
COLUMN SUMS	619	808	262	141	1830
	33.825	44.153	14.317	7.705	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-7 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of Job Done by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = SUPERIORS UNDERSTAND PERFORMANCE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	78 30.588 12.093	126 49.412 15.236	33 12.941 12.313	18 7.059 12.587	255 100.000 13.542
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	113 32.471 17.519	132 37.931 15.961	71 20.402 26.493	32 9.195 22.378	348 100.000 18.481
4-5 YEARS	111 30.295 17.519	177 47.453 21.403	56 15.013 20.896	27 7.239 18.881	373 100.000 19.809
6-10 YEARS	206 34.106 31.939	271 44.868 32.769	76 12.583 29.158	51 8.444 35.664	604 100.000 32.076
11-15 YEARS	104 43.154 16.124	95 39.419 11.487	29 12.033 10.821	13 5.394 9.091	241 100.000 12.799
16+ YEARS	31 50.000 4.806	26 41.935 3.144	3 4.839 1.119	2 3.226 1.399	62 100.000 3.293
COLUMN SUMS	645 34.254 100.000	827 43.919 100.000	268 14.233 100.000	143 7.594 100.000	1883 100.000 100.000

TABLES 4-8 Through 4-11 "I am Recognized by Others in my Institution as Holding an Important Position"

As shown in Table 4-8, almost 80 percent of the respondents agreed (moderately or strongly) that they were recognized by others as holding an important position. However, there are statistically significant differences (at the .01 level) in the responses to this question depending upon title. Although 83.9 percent of Directors agreed that they were recognized by others as holding an important position, only 59.3 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors, and 70.1 percent of Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors expressed the same opinion. Directors were over twice as likely to strongly agree that they were recognized as holding an important position as Associate/Assistant Directors. Over 40 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors did not believe that others recognized them as holding an important position.

As the percentage of employment time devoted to financial aid decreased, respondents were more likely to strongly agree (Table 4-9) that they were recognized by others in their institution as holding an important position (significant at the .01 level):

Percentage of time in financial aid:	Percentage expressing strong agreement relating to recognition by others:
100%	26.4%
50% or less	47.8%

For a summary of the kinds of job responsibilities held by financial aid administrators external to the Financial Aid Office, see Table 1-17.

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between perceived recognition as holding an important position and institutional control and type. Over 55 percent of the respondents from proprietary institutions strongly believed that they were recognized as holding an important position. Less than one-third of the respondents from independent institutions were in the "strongly agree" category, while less than one-fourth of the respondents from public institutions were in this category (Table 4-10).

As shown in Table 4-11, respondents from 2-year institutions showed the least tendency (26.3%) to strongly agree that they were recognized as holding an important position while those at vocational/technical schools showed the greatest incidence of strong agreement (48.1%).

Table 4-8 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.)?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	467 34.088 80.936	682 49.781 75.193	167 12.190 61.397	54 3.942 54.000	1370 100.000 73.815
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	25 15.432 4.333	71 43.827 7.828	52 32.099 19.118	14 8.642 14.000	162 100.000 8.728
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	41 23.870 7.452	86 46.739 9.482	34 18.478 12.500	21 11.413 21.000	184 100.000 9.914
OTHER	42 30.000 7.279	68 48.571 7.497	19 13.571 6.985	11 7.857 11.000	140 100.000 7.543
COLUMN SUMS	577 31.088 100.000	907 48.869 100.000	272 14.655 100.000	100 5.388 100.000	1856 100.000 100.000

Table 4-9 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Percentage of Employment Time in Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.)?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
100%	286 26.388 49.310	537 49.539 59.076	131 12.620 70.221	70 6.458 69.307	1044 100.000 58.217
75-99%	111 30.579 19.138	184 50.689 20.242	51 14.050 18.750	17 4.683 16.832	363 100.000 19.495
50-74%	73 39.459 12.586	89 48.108 9.791	18 9.730 6.618	5 2.703 4.950	185 100.000 9.936
LESS THAN HALF	110 47.826 18.966	99 43.043 10.891	12 5.217 4.412	9 3.914 8.911	230 100.000 12.352
COLUMN SUMS	580 31.149 100.000	909 48.818 100.000	272 14.608 100.000	101 5.424 100.000	1862 100.000 100.000

Table 4-10 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION:	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	194	406	140	55	795
	24.403	51.069	17.610	6.918	100.000
	33.798	44.714	51.471	54.455	42.857
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	299	442	126	46	913
	32.749	48.412	13.801	5.038	100.000
	52.091	48.678	46.324	45.545	49.218
PROPRIETARY	81	60	6		147
	55.102	40.816	4.082		100.000
	14.111	6.608	2.206		7.925
COLUMN SUMS	574	908	272	101	1855
	30.943	48.949	14.663	5.445	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-11 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Institutional Type

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	77	69	8	6	160
	48.125	43.125	5.000	3.750	100.000
	13.775	7.814	3.008	6.000	8.850
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	93	183	53	24	353
	26.346	51.841	15.014	6.799	100.000
	16.637	20.725	19.925	24.000	19.524
4 YEAR	126	227	78	16	447
	28.188	50.783	17.450	3.579	100.000
	22.540	25.708	29.323	16.000	24.723
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	192	330	108	40	670
	28.657	49.254	16.119	5.970	100.000
	34.347	37.373	40.602	40.000	37.058
NURSING	16	16	5	3	40
	40.000	40.000	12.500	7.500	100.000
	2.862	1.812	1.880	3.000	2.212
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	55	58	14	11	138
	39.855	42.029	10.145	7.971	100.000
	9.839	6.569	5.263	11.000	7.633
COLUMN SUMS	559	883	266	100	1808
	30.918	48.838	14.712	5.531	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 4-12 Through 4-16 "Financial Aid Work is Sufficiently Satisfying to be a Lifetime Career for Me"

A total of 69.2 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that the financial aid profession was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-12). A majority of the respondents (60.3%) under 25 stated that the financial aid profession was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-13), and this percentage increased to 80 percent in the group aged 60 and over (significant at the .01 level). A related finding is that the attractiveness of the financial aid profession increases as length of employment in financial aid increases. Ninety percent of the respondents who have worked 16 or more years in the financial aid profession find it sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career. It is interesting to note, however, that over 60 percent of the respondents with one year or less experience agree that the financial aid profession is sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-14).

There are few differences in financial aid as a career choice based upon institutional control (public, independent, proprietary) and institutional size. However, there are a number of differences based upon institutional type. Over 70 percent of the respondents in three of the institutional type categories agreed that financial aid work was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career. Although Nursing Schools had the highest percentage of respondents who "strongly agreed," respondents from Nursing Schools and Graduate/Professional Schools also had the highest percentages of respondents who were less likely to see the financial aid profession as their lifetime career (Table 4-15).

As shown in Table 4-16, female respondents were more likely to view financial aid as a career than were men (significant at the .01 level). There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) by racial/ethnic group.

Table 4-12 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	167	536	268	121	1332
	30.556	40.240	20.120	9.084	100.000
	26.075	74.860	73.626	62.694	73.673
ASSOC./I	53	62	24	20	161
ASSIS.	32.919	38.509	16.149	12.422	100.000
DIRECT.	8.307	8.659	7.143	10.363	8.905
FIN.AID	41	73	43	26	187
OFFICER	21.925	39.037	22.995	13.904	100.000
COUN/AD	6.411	10.196	11.813	13.472	10.343
OTHER	101	95	27	26	128
	23.438	35.156	21.094	20.313	100.000
	15.827	13.285	7.418	13.472	7.080
COLUMN SUMS	585	716	364	193	1808
	23.591	39.602	20.133	10.675	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-13 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Age

ROWS = AGE COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	25	48	32	16	121
	20.661	39.669	26.446	13.223	100.000
	4.673	6.723	8.791	8.247	6.696
26-30	78	143	101	48	370
	21.081	38.649	27.297	12.973	100.000
	14.579	20.028	27.747	24.742	20.476
31-35	77	143	89	41	350
	22.000	40.857	25.429	11.714	100.000
	14.393	20.028	24.451	21.134	19.369
36-40	78	114	45	27	264
	29.545	43.182	17.045	10.227	100.000
	14.579	15.966	12.363	13.918	14.610
41-50	127	149	57	29	362
	35.083	41.160	15.746	8.011	100.000
	23.738	20.868	15.659	14.948	20.033
51-59	111	96	31	27	265
	41.887	36.226	11.698	10.189	100.000
	20.748	13.445	8.516	13.918	14.665
60+	39	21	9	6	75
	52.000	28.000	12.000	8.000	100.000
	7.290	2.941	2.473	3.093	4.151
COL SUMS	535	714	364	194	1807
	29.607	39.513	20.144	10.736	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-14 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	58	96	58	38	246
	23.951	39.024	23.577	15.447	100.000
	10.056	13.445	15.934	19.487	13.591
2-4 YEARS EXPER.	73	118	93	48	332
	21.988	35.542	28.012	14.458	100.000
	13.598	16.527	25.549	24.615	18.343
5-5 YEARS	98	137	90	30	355
	28.789	38.592	25.352	11.268	100.000
	16.387	19.188	24.725	20.513	19.613
6-10 YEARS	191	245	90	56	582
	33.162	42.096	15.464	9.278	100.000
	35.940	18.318	24.725	27.692	32.155
11-15 YEARS	96	97	29	13	235
	40.851	41.277	12.340	5.532	100.000
	17.877	13.585	7.967	6.667	12.983
16+ YEARS	33	21	8	2	60
	55.000	35.000	6.667	3.333	100.000
	6.145	2.941	1.099	1.026	3.315
COLUMN SUMS	537	714	364	195	1810
	29.669	39.448	20.110	10.773	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-15 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Institutional Type

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE: COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC.	47	63	33	13	156
TECH.	30.128	40.385	21.154	8.333	100.000
	9.180	9.013	9.270	6.878	8.884
2 YEARS	87	134	88	36	345
& UNDER	25.217	38.841	25.507	10.435	100.000
NOT V.T	16.992	19.170	24.719	19.048	19.647
4 YEAR	139	187	80	32	438
	31.735	42.694	18.265	7.306	100.000
	27.148	26.753	22.472	16.931	24.943
4 YEAR	206	271	111	62	650
AND	31.692	41.692	17.077	9.538	100.000
BEYOND	40.234	38.770	31.180	32.804	37.016
NURSING	12	8	8	6	34
	35.294	23.529	23.529	17.647	100.000
	2.344	1.144	2.247	3.175	1.936
GRAD/	21	36	36	40	133
PROFES.	15.789	27.068	27.068	30.075	100.000
ONLY	4.102	5.150	10.112	21.164	7.574
COLUMN SUMS	512	699	356	189	1756
	29.157	39.806	20.273	10.763	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-16 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Sex

ROWS = SEX COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
MALE	304	464	246	118	1132
	26.855	40.989	21.731	10.424	100.000
	56.611	65.077	67.769	62.105	62.784
FEMALE	233	249	117	72	671
	34.724	37.109	17.437	10.730	100.000
	43.389	34.923	32.231	37.895	37.216
COLUMN SUMS	537	713	363	190	1803
	29.784	39.545	20.133	10.538	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 5-1 Through 5-3 "Communications from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations are Generally Adequate to Keep me Up to Date with Changes in Legislation, Regulations, and with Current Issues in Financial Aid"

As shown in Table 5-1, over 85 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that communications from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations were adequate to keep them informed about current issues in financial aid. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in the responses by title, institutional type, or by years worked in financial aid. This latter finding is interesting in the sense that present communiques are seen as meaningful by financial aid administrators with experience ranging from less than one year to over 16 years (Table 5-2).

Institutional size had a significant effect (at the .01 level) on the perceived adequacy of communiques from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations. In general, as institutional size increased, respondents were less likely to find NASFAA and regional communiques adequate to keep them up to date. However, even among respondents from the largest institutions (20,000 students and over), 78.1 percent found the present communications efforts to be adequate (Table 5-3).

Table 5-1 Adequacy of Communications by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = NASFAA & SFA COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	477	686	155	34	1352
	35.281	50.740	11.464	2.515	100.000
	75.714	73.605	77.500	72.340	74.737
ASSOC./ASSIS.	52	90	15	3	160
	32.500	56.250	9.375	1.875	100.000
DIRECT.	8.254	9.657	7.500	6.383	8.845
FIN.AID OFFICER	63	94	16	3	176
	35.795	53.409	9.091	1.705	100.000
COUN/AD	10.000	10.086	8.000	6.383	9.729
OTHER	38	62	14	7	121
	31.405	51.240	11.570	5.785	100.000
	6.032	6.652	7.000	14.894	6.689
COLUMN SUMS	630	932	200	47	1809
	34.826	51.520	11.056	2.598	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 5-2 Adequacy of Communications by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID	COLUMNS = NASFAA & SFA COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	83 35.470 13.175	133 56.838 14.255	11 4.701 5.473	7 2.991 14.894	234 100.000 12.921
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	114 34.756 18.095	167 50.915 17.899	40 12.195 19.900	7 2.134 14.894	328 100.000 18.112
4-5 YEARS	125 37.098 21.429	185 50.824 19.829	36 9.890 17.910	8 2.198 17.021	364 100.000 20.099
6-10 YEARS	204 34.694 32.381	288 48.980 30.868	79 13.435 39.303	17 2.891 36.170	588 100.000 32.468
11-15 YEARS	71 30.085 11.270	127 53.814 13.612	30 12.712 14.925	8 3.390 17.021	236 100.000 13.031
16+ YEARS	21 37.705 3.651	33 58.098 3.537	5 8.197 2.488		61 100.000 3.368
COLUMN SUMS	630 34.787 100.000	933 51.518 100.000	201 11.099 100.000	47 2.595 100.000	1811 100.000 100.000

Table 5-3 Adequacy of Communications by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = NASFAA & SFA COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	231 33.565 16.783	294 50.342 11.545	52 8.904 25.871	7 1.199 14.894	584 100.000 32.301
1000-1999	184 33.577 29.299	297 54.197 31.867	54 9.854 26.866	13 2.372 27.660	548 100.000 30.310
4000-9999	95 32.311 15.127	152 51.701 16.309	39 13.265 19.403	8 2.721 17.021	294 100.000 16.261
10,000-19,999	73 33.641 11.624	105 48.387 11.266	31 14.286 15.423	8 3.687 17.021	217 100.000 12.002
20,000+	45 27.273 7.166	84 50.909 9.013	25 15.152 12.438	11 6.667 23.404	165 100.000 9.126
COLUMN SUMS	628 34.735 100.000	932 51.549 100.000	201 11.117 100.000	47 2.600 100.000	1808 100.000 100.000

TABLES 5-4 Through 5-8 "In General, Professional Training Programs Which I Have Engaged in as a Participant Have Been Adequate"

Professional financial aid training programs were judged to be adequate by over 84 percent of the respondents with 59.5 percent of the respondents expressing moderate agreement with their adequacy (Table 5-4).

As shown in Table 5-5, respondents with Ph.D.'s were approximately twice as likely to find training programs inadequate as were respondents in other educational groups. Slightly over one-fourth of those holding the Ph.D. found training programs to be inadequate (significant at the .01 level).

Another group which tended to be more critical of the adequacy of training programs were respondents employed in offices serving graduate/professional students (significant at the .01 level). Respondents from graduate/professional programs represented approximately 7.9 percent of those completing the questionnaire, and slightly over one-fourth of them found training programs to be in need of improvement (Table 5-6).

There were no differences (at the .05 level) between responses relating to the adequacy of training based upon institutional type (public, independent, proprietary). However, there were significant differences (at the .01 level) between the perceived adequacy of training and the size of the respondent's institution. Respondents from small institutions were more likely to strongly agree that training had been adequate than were respondents from large institutions (Table 5-7).

The perceived adequacy of training programs was also related to geographic area (Table 5-8). Respondents from the Rocky Mountain region were the most likely to express satisfaction with training programs, while those from the Western region were the most likely to express dissatisfaction (significant at the .01 level).

Table 5-4 Adequacy of Training Programs by Title

ROWS = TITLE	COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	339 25.037 75.333	821 60.635 75.668	157 11.595 69.161	37 2.733 58.730	1354 100.000 74.192
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	32 19.876 7.111	93 57.764 8.571	27 16.770 11.894	9 5.590 14.286	161 100.000 8.822
FIN.AID OFFICER	46 25.275 10.222	107 58.791 9.862	22 12.088 9.692	7 3.846 11.111	182 100.000 9.973
OTHER	33 25.781 7.333	64 50.000 5.899	21 16.406 9.251	10 7.813 15.873	128 100.000 7.014
COLUMN SUMS	450 24.658 100.000	1085 59.452 100.000	227 12.438 100.000	63 3.452 100.000	1825 100.000 100.000

Table 5-5 Adequcy of Training Programs by Education

ROWS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED	COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
DOCTO-RATE	15	54	17	8	94
	15.957	57.447	18.085	8.511	100.000
	1.398	4.991	7.456	12.500	5.159
MASTERS	219	561	118	30	928
	23.599	60.453	12.716	3.233	100.000
	48.884	51.848	51.754	46.875	50.933
BACHE-LORS	186	300	72	21	531
	25.188	56.497	13.559	3.955	100.000
	10.804	27.726	11.579	32.813	29.148
ASSO-CIATE	27	43	5	1	76
	35.526	56.579	6.579	1.316	100.000
	6.327	3.974	2.193	1.563	4.171
OTHER	84	124	16	4	193
	25.389	64.249	8.290	2.073	100.000
	10.938	11.460	7.018	6.250	10.593
COLUMN SUMS	448	1082	228	64	1822
	24.588	59.385	12.514	3.513	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 5-6 Adequacy of Training Programs by Kinds of Students Served

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED	COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	21	84	24	13	144
	15.972	58.333	16.667	9.028	100.000
	5.122	7.742	10.526	20.313	7.886
UNDERGR GRAD. ONLY	268	579	100	24	971
	27.600	54.629	10.299	2.472	100.000
	59.688	53.364	43.860	37.500	53.176
UNDGRS GR/PROF	159	422	104	27	711
	22.222	59.353	14.627	3.797	100.000
	35.199	38.834	45.614	42.188	38.938
COLUMN SUMS	448	1085	228	64	1826
	24.589	59.419	12.486	3.505	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 5-7 Adequacy of Training Programs by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE	COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	161 26.969 35.857	354 59.296 32.657	72 12.060 31.718	10 1.675 15.625	597 100.000 32.730
1000-3999	147 27.072 32.739	316 58.195 29.151	61 11.234 26.872	19 3.499 29.688	543 100.000 29.770
4000-9999	70 23.810 15.590	177 60.204 16.328	33 11.224 14.537	14 4.762 21.875	294 100.000 16.118
10,000-19,999	47 21.171 10.468	134 60.360 12.362	33 14.865 14.537	8 3.604 12.500	222 100.000 12.171
20,000+	24 14.286 5.345	103 61.310 9.502	28 16.667 12.335	13 7.738 20.313	168 100.000 9.211
COLUMN SUMS	449 24.616 100.000	1084 59.430 100.000	227 12.445 100.000	64 3.509 100.000	1824 100.000 100.000

Table 5-8 Adequacy of Training Programs by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES	COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	113 22.510 25.508	308 61.355 28.678	64 12.749 28.444	17 3.386 27.419	502 100.000 27.827
SASFAA	86 30.389 19.413	156 55.124 14.525	32 11.307 14.222	9 3.180 14.516	283 100.000 15.687
MASFAA	130 24.074 29.345	333 61.667 31.006	62 11.481 27.556	15 2.778 24.194	540 100.000 29.933
SWASFAA	40 23.952 9.029	100 59.880 9.311	21 12.575 9.333	6 3.593 9.677	167 100.000 9.257
RMASFAA	39 39.080 7.675	48 55.172 4.469	5 5.747 2.222		87 100.000 4.823
WASFAA	40 17.778 9.029	129 57.333 12.011	41 18.222 18.222	15 6.667 24.194	225 100.000 12.472
COLUMN SUMS	443 24.557 100.000	1074 59.534 100.000	225 12.472 100.000	62 3.437 100.000	1804 100.000 100.000

TABLES 6-1 Through 6-3 "Institutions Should Have Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers Between the SEOG, CWS, and NDSL Programs"

The need for increased authority for interfund transfers received overwhelming support (Table 6-1). Over 60 percent of the respondents strongly agreed with the need for increased authority in this area and over 91 percent agreed (either strongly or moderately). Strong support was also received among all varieties of institutional type, control, and size. As institutional size increased, there was a significant tendency (at the .01 level) for stronger agreement with the need for liberalized transfer policies (Table 6-2).

Liberalized transfer policies received the support of no less than 88 percent of the respondents in each of the six geographic regions of the country (Table 6-3).

Table 6-1 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Title

ROWS - TITLE	COLUMNS - NEED FOR SEOG/CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	812	351	83	35	1281
TOR	61.358	27.400	6.479	2.732	100.000
	77.774	69.505	77.570	79.545	75.353
ASSOC./	91	56	6	1	154
ASSIS.	59.091	36.364	3.896	0.649	100.000
DIRECT.	8.716	11.089	5.607	2.273	9.059
FIN.AID	65	58	11	4	158
OFFICER	41.797	36.709	6.962	2.532	100.000
COUN/AD	6.142	11.485	10.280	9.091	9.294
OTHER	56	40	7	4	107
	52.336	37.383	6.542	3.738	100.000
	5.364	7.921	6.542	9.091	6.294
COLUMN SUMS	1044	505	107	44	1700
	61.412	29.706	6.294	2.588	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-2 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = NEED FOR SEOG/CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	263	197	33	19	512
	51.367	38.477	6.445	3.711	100.000
	25.720	38.780	31.132	31.818	30.118
1000-3999	332	145	36	18	531
	62.524	27.307	6.780	3.390	100.000
	31.862	28.543	33.962	40.909	31.235
4000-9999	191	70	20	4	285
	67.018	24.561	7.018	1.404	100.000
	18.330	13.780	18.868	9.091	16.765
10,000-19,999	140	53	11	7	211
	66.351	25.118	5.213	3.318	100.000
	13.436	10.433	10.377	15.909	12.412
20,000+	111	43	6	1	161
	68.944	26.708	3.727	0.621	100.000
	10.653	8.465	5.660	2.273	9.471
COLUMN SUMS	1042	508	106	44	1700
	61.294	29.882	6.235	2.588	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-3 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = NEED FOR SEOG/CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	295	135	30	9	469
	62.900	28.785	6.397	1.919	100.000
	28.447	27.000	28.571	21.429	27.850
SASFAA	142	102	18	6	268
	52.985	38.060	6.716	2.239	100.000
	13.693	20.400	17.143	14.286	15.914
MASFAA	304	154	25	12	495
	61.414	31.111	5.051	2.424	100.000
	29.315	30.800	23.810	28.571	29.394
SWASFAA	98	40	13	4	155
	63.226	25.806	8.387	2.581	100.000
	9.450	8.000	12.381	9.524	9.204
RMASFAA	54	20	7	3	84
	64.286	23.810	8.333	3.571	100.000
	5.207	4.000	6.667	7.143	4.988
WASFAA	144	49	12	8	213
	67.606	23.005	5.634	3.756	100.000
	13.886	9.800	11.429	19.048	12.648
COLUMN SUMS	1037	500	105	42	1684
	61.580	29.691	6.235	2.498	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 6-4 Through 6-6 "My Institution Would have a Greater Feeling of Responsibility for the BEOG and GSL Programs if we Received a Federal Administrative Allowance"

Over 81 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately that receipt of a federal administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG and GSL programs. Directors of Financial Aid were more likely to agree with the above statement than were respondents in other job categories (Table 6-4). Respondents from public institutions were the most likely to strongly agree that an administrative allowance in the BEOG and GSL programs would promote a greater sense of institutional responsibility (Table 6-5).

There were some differences in responses to this question based upon region of the country (Table 6-6). However, no fewer than 78.5 percent of the respondents in any region agreed that payment of an administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG and GSL programs.

Table 6-4 Greater Responsibility if Received Administrative Allowance by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = FED. ADMINI. ALLOW INCR. RESP FOR BEOG & GSL PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	712	337	141	82	1272
TOR	55.975	26.494	11.085	6.447	100.000
	77.818	71.398	68.116	71.214	74.560
ASSOC./	76	45	27	10	158
ASSIS.	48.101	28.481	17.089	6.329	100.000
DIRECT.	8.306	9.534	13.043	8.929	9.261
FIN.AID	70	58	25	9	162
OFFICER	43.210	35.802	15.432	5.556	100.000
COUN/AD	7.650	12.288	12.077	8.036	9.496
OTHER	57	32	14	11	114
	50.000	28.070	12.281	9.649	100.000
	6.230	6.780	6.763	9.821	6.682
COLUMN SUMS	915	472	207	112	1706
	53.634	27.667	12.134	6.565	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-5 Greater Responsibility if Received Administrative Allowance by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = FED. ADMINI. ALLOW INCR. RESP FOR BEOG & GSL PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	454	186	81	33	754
	60.212	24.668	10.743	4.377	100.000
	49.672	39.490	38.942	29.730	44.249
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	391	240	112	68	811
	48.212	29.593	13.810	8.385	100.000
	42.779	50.955	53.846	61.261	47.594
PROPRIETARY	69	45	15	10	139
	49.640	32.374	10.791	7.194	100.000
	7.549	9.554	7.212	9.009	8.157
COLUMN SUMS	914	471	208	111	1704
	53.638	27.641	12.207	6.514	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-6 Greater Responsibility if Received Administrative Allowance by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = FED. ADMINI. ALLOW INCR. RESP FOR BEOG & GSL PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	238	124	68	33	459
	51.852	27.015	13.943	7.190	100.000
	26.298	26.609	31.373	29.464	27.208
SASFAA	167	63	25	17	272
	61.397	23.162	9.191	6.250	100.000
	18.453	13.519	12.255	15.179	16.123
MASFAA	233	163	73	35	504
	46.230	32.341	14.484	6.944	100.000
	25.746	34.979	35.784	31.250	29.876
SWASFAA	86	47	12	11	156
	55.128	30.128	7.692	7.051	100.000
	9.503	10.086	5.882	9.821	9.247
RMASFAA	53	17	9	4	83
	63.855	20.482	10.843	4.819	100.000
	5.856	3.648	4.412	3.571	4.920
WASFAA	128	52	21	12	213
	60.094	24.413	9.859	5.634	100.000
	14.144	11.159	10.294	10.714	12.626
COLUMN SUMS	905	466	204	112	1687
	53.646	27.623	12.092	6.639	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 6-7 and 6-8 "The Tri-Partite Application Process Should be Revised to Depend more Heavily Upon Verifiable, Historical Data"

The need to change the Tri-Partite application process to depend more upon verifiable, historical data was expressed by 79.9 percent of the respondents. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) to responses to this question by type or control of institution, institutional size, or region of the country. However, as years of experience increase, there is a noticeable tendency (significant at the .05 level) for respondents to agree more strongly with the need to use verifiable, historical data in the Tri-Partite application process.

Table 6-7 Tri-Partite Application Process Should be Revised by Title

ROWS = TITLE	COLUMNS = REVISE TRI-PARTITE APPLICATION PROCESS?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONGLY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	942 76.823 77.273	533 43.439 73.517	197 16.055 76.357	55 4.482 79.710	1227 100.000 75.554
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	57 39.860 4.765	63 44.056 8.690	19 13.287 7.364	4 2.797 5.797	143 100.000 8.805
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	43 28.105 3.527	79 51.634 10.897	26 16.993 10.078	5 3.268 7.246	153 100.000 9.421
OTHER	30 29.703 2.465	50 49.505 6.897	16 15.842 6.202	5 4.950 7.246	101 100.000 6.219
COLUMN SUMS	1218 75.000 100.000	725 44.643 100.000	258 15.887 100.000	69 4.249 100.000	1624 100.000

Table 6-8 Tri-Partite Application Process Should be Revised by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID	COLUMNS = REVISE TRI-PARTITE APPLICATION PROCESS?				
	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	51 27.273 8.932	98 52.406 13.462	32 17.112 12.451	6 3.209 8.571	187 100.000 11.501
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	97 33.564 16.998	135 46.713 18.544	50 17.301 19.455	7 2.422 10.000	289 100.000 17.774
4-5 YEARS	101 30.982 17.688	149 45.706 20.467	55 16.871 21.401	21 6.442 30.000	326 100.000 20.049
6-10 YEARS	206 37.798 36.077	233 42.752 32.005	85 15.596 33.074	21 3.853 30.000	545 100.000 33.518
11-15 YEARS	92 40.708 16.112	91 40.265 12.500	29 12.832 11.284	14 6.195 20.000	226 100.000 13.899
16+ YEARS	24 45.283 4.203	22 41.509 3.022	6 11.321 2.335	1 1.887 1.429	53 100.000 3.260
COLUMN SUMS	571 35.117 100.000	728 44.772 100.000	257 15.806 100.000	70 4.305 100.000	1626 100.000 100.000

TABLES 6-9 Through 6-11 "The Regional Review Panel Process is an Equitable Way of Making Funding Decisions"

Approximately 50 percent of the respondents agreed that the panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions while 50 percent disagreed. However, 22.2 percent expressed strong disagreement, while only 7.8 percent strongly agreed that the panel process was an equitable vehicle for funding decisions. Based upon title, there were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in responses to the perceived equity of the panel process.

As shown in Table 6-10, respondents from proprietary institutions were approximately twice as likely as those from other groups of institutions to strongly agree that the panel process is an equitable way to make funding decisions.

Support for the panel process decreases as institutional size increases (Table 6-11). Respondents from the largest institutions were twice as likely to express strong disagreement as those from institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (significant at the .01 level).

Table 6-9 The Regional Panel Process is Equitable by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = REGIONAL REVIEW EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	105 8.261 73.595	503 39.575 73.004	369 29.032 75.153	294 23.131 78.610	1271 100.000 75.386
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	10 6.711 7.576	58 38.926 8.418	49 12.886 9.980	32 21.477 8.556	149 100.000 8.837
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	8 4.908 6.061	78 47.853 11.321	42 25.767 8.554	35 21.472 9.358	163 100.000 9.668
OTHER	9 8.738 6.818	50 48.544 7.257	31 30.097 6.314	13 12.621 3.476	103 100.000 6.109
COLUMN SUMS	132 7.829 100.000	689 40.866 100.000	491 29.122 100.000	374 22.183 100.000	1686 100.000 100.000

Table 6-10 The Regional Panel Process is Equitable by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = REGIONAL REVIEW EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	47	291	235	177	750
	6.267	38.800	31.333	23.600	100.000
	35.878	42.113	47.764	47.453	44.458
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	64	347	229	169	809
	7.911	42.892	28.307	20.890	100.000
	48.855	50.217	46.545	45.308	47.955
PROPRIETARY	20	53	28	27	128
	15.625	41.406	21.875	21.094	100.000
	15.267	7.670	5.691	7.239	7.587
COLUMN SUMS	131	691	492	373	1687
	7.765	40.960	29.164	22.110	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-11 The Regional Panel Process is Equitable by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = REGIONAL REVIEW EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	48	249	150	72	519
	9.249	47.977	28.902	13.873	100.000
	37.209	36.035	30.426	19.303	30.783
1000-3999	36	216	150	120	522
	6.897	41.379	28.736	22.989	100.000
	27.907	31.259	30.426	32.172	30.961
4000-9999	23	100	76	84	283
	8.127	35.336	26.855	29.682	100.000
	17.829	14.472	15.416	22.520	16.785
10,000-19,999	16	76	57	56	205
	7.805	37.073	27.805	27.317	100.000
	12.403	10.999	11.562	15.013	12.159
20,000+	6	50	60	41	157
	3.822	31.847	38.217	26.115	100.000
	4.651	7.236	12.170	10.992	9.312
COLUMN SUMS	129	691	493	373	1686
	7.651	40.985	29.241	22.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 6-12 Through 6-14 "There is a Need for Periodic Program Reviews of Financial Aid Offices by U. S. Office of Education Staff"

The need for periodic program reviews by the U. S. Office of Education was underscored by the fact that over 90 percent of the respondents agreed that they were necessary (Table 6-12). Respondents from public institutions expressed the strongest sentiments in favor of periodic program reviews, although over 87 percent of the respondents from independent and proprietary institutions agreed (either moderately or strongly) with the need for periodic program reviews (Table 6-13).

As years of experience in financial aid increase, there is a significant tendency (at the .01 level) for respondents to express stronger agreement with the need for program reviews by the U. S. Office of Education (Table 6-14).

Table 6-12 Need for USOE Program Reviews by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	672	566	80	28	1346
	49.926	42.051	5.944	2.080	100.000
	77.509	71.016	72.072	62.222	73.956
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	92	72	7	3	164
	56.098	43.902	4.268	1.829	100.000
	9.458	9.034	6.306	6.667	9.011
FIN.AID OFFICER	59	105	14	4	182
	32.418	57.692	7.692	2.198	100.000
COUN/AD	6.805	13.174	12.613	8.889	10.000
OTHER	54	54	10	10	128
	42.188	42.188	7.813	7.813	100.000
	6.224	6.775	9.009	22.222	7.033
COLUMN SUMS	867	797	111	45	1820
	47.637	43.791	6.099	2.473	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-13 Need for USOE Program Reviews by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION
COLUMNS = NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	449	305	21	14	789
	56.907	38.657	2.662	1.774	100.000
	51.908	38.269	18.750	31.818	43.399
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	355	420	78	28	881
	40.295	47.673	8.854	3.178	100.000
	41.040	52.698	69.643	63.636	48.460
PROPRIETARY	61	72	13	2	148
	41.216	48.649	8.784	1.351	100.000
	7.052	9.034	11.607	4.545	8.141
COLUMN SUMS	865	797	112	44	1818
	47.580	43.839	6.161	2.420	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-14 Need for USOE Program Reviews by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID
COLUMNS = NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	73	124	30	6	233
	31.330	53.219	12.876	2.575	100.000
	8.439	15.481	27.027	13.333	12.788
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	140	167	18	5	330
	42.424	50.606	5.455	1.515	100.000
	16.185	20.849	16.216	11.111	18.112
4-5 YEARS	190	151	18	10	369
	51.491	40.921	4.878	2.710	100.000
	21.965	18.851	16.216	22.222	20.252
6-10 YEARS	311	237	31	16	595
	52.269	39.832	5.210	2.689	100.000
	35.954	29.588	27.928	35.556	32.656
11-15 YEARS	118	104	12	4	238
	49.580	43.697	5.042	1.681	100.000
	13.642	12.984	10.811	8.889	13.063
16+ YEARS	33	18	2	4	57
	57.895	31.579	3.509	7.018	100.000
	3.815	2.247	1.802	8.889	3.128
COLUMN SUMS	865	801	111	45	1822
	47.475	43.963	6.092	2.470	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 6-15 Through 6-17 "My Institution has Received Good Support From the Regional U. S. Office of Education"

Over 85 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that their institution had received good support from the Regional Office of Education. Directors of Financial Aid were most likely to strongly agree that their institution had received good support (Table 6-15).

There were no significant differences in responses to the above statement based upon control or size of the respondents' institutions. There were, however, differences by institutional type, but no group of institutions had less than 78 percent of their respondents expressing strong or moderate agreement that their institution had received good support (Table 6-16).

As shown in Table 6-17, there were significant differences (at the .01 level) between whether respondents thought they had received good support from the Office of Education based upon geographic region. However, at least 70 percent of the respondents in each region stated that they had received good support. Respondents from the states covered by the Rocky Mountain, Southern, and Southwestern financial aid associations were most likely to express strong agreement, while respondents from WASFAA were most likely to express either moderate or strong disagreement.

Table 6-15 Good Support from Regional USOE by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = GOOD SUPPORT FROM U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONGLY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	523	596	148	36	1308
TOR	40.367	45.566	11.315	2.752	100.000
	80.365	70.952	78.307	63.158	75.043
ASSOC./	53	82	15	5	155
ASSIS.	34.194	52.903	9.677	3.226	100.000
DIRECT.	8.067	9.762	7.937	8.772	8.893
FIN.AID	50	93	16	9	168
OFFICER	29.762	55.357	9.524	5.357	100.000
COUN/AD	7.610	11.071	8.466	15.789	9.639
OTHER	26	69	10	7	112
	23.214	61.607	8.929	6.250	100.000
	3.957	8.214	5.291	12.281	6.426
COLUMN SUMS	657	840	189	57	1743
	37.694	48.193	10.843	3.270	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-16 Good Support from Regional USOE by Institutional Type

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = GOOD SUPPORT FROM U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	68 44.444 10.625	74 48.366 9.035	9 5.882 4.891	2 1.307 3.636	153 100.000 9.011
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T.	117 34.615 18.281	174 51.479 21.245	33 9.763 17.935	14 4.142 25.455	338 100.000 19.906
4 YEAR	181 42.191 28.281	194 45.221 23.687	45 10.490 24.457	9 2.098 16.364	429 100.000 25.265
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	238 37.838 37.188	294 46.741 35.897	79 12.560 42.935	18 2.862 32.727	629 100.000 37.048
NURSING	13 37.143 2.031	16 45.714 1.954	3 8.571 1.630	3 8.571 5.455	35 100.000 2.061
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	23 20.175 3.594	67 58.772 8.181	15 13.158 8.152	9 7.895 16.364	114 100.000 6.714
COLUMN SUMS	640 37.691 100.000	819 48.233 100.000	184 10.836 100.000	55 3.239 100.000	1698 100.000 100.000

Table 6-17 Good Support from Regional USOE by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = GOOD SUPPORT FROM U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	140 29.046 21.538	266 55.187 32.048	58 12.033 31.183	18 3.734 31.579	482 100.000 27.978
SASFAA	131 48.881 20.154	119 44.403 14.337	14 5.224 7.527	4 1.493 7.018	268 100.000 15.558
MASFAA	172 33.992 26.462	261 51.581 31.446	57 11.265 30.645	16 3.162 28.070	506 100.000 29.367
SWASFAA	96 58.537 14.769	55 33.537 6.627	11 6.707 5.914	2 1.220 3.509	164 100.000 9.518
RMASFAA	57 66.279 8.769	27 31.395 3.253	2 2.326 1.075		86 100.000 4.991
WASFAA	54 24.885 8.308	102 47.005 12.289	44 20.276 23.656	17 7.834 29.825	217 100.000 12.594
COLUMN SUMS	650 37.725 100.000	830 48.172 100.000	186 10.795 100.000	57 3.308 100.000	1723 100.000 100.000

TABLES 7-1 Through 7-4 "Even Given Equal Financial Need, Half-Time Students are Less Likely to be Assisted than Full-Time Students at my Institution"

As shown in Table 7-1, approximately two-thirds of the respondents stated that, given equal need, half-time students would be less likely to be assisted at their institution than full-time students. There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in responses to the above statement depending upon institutional type and control (Table 7-2). For example, respondents from proprietary institutions were approximately twice as likely as respondents from independent institutions to disagree with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students.

The highest level of disagreement (72.2%) with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students came from respondents working for Nursing Schools. Over 40 percent of the respondents from vocational/technical schools and 2-year colleges disagreed with the statement that at their institution, half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students (Table 7-3).

Reactions to the likelihood of financial aid for half-time students varied significantly (at the .01 level) based upon region of the country. For example, in EASFAA states, 23.9 percent of respondents disagreed with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students. In SWASFAA states, however, over 46 percent of the respondents disagreed.

Table 7-1 Full-Time Students Receive Priority by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	176 11.111 72.031	430 35.833 76.512	192 16.000 75.294	202 16.833 72.662	1200 100.000 74.212
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	60 19.735 11.494	43 28.477 7.651	24 15.898 9.412	24 15.894 8.633	151 100.000 9.338
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	42 28.179 8.046	57 38.514 10.142	19 12.838 7.451	30 20.270 10.791	148 100.000 9.153
OTHER	84 37.288 8.429	32 27.119 5.694	20 16.949 7.843	22 18.644 7.914	118 100.000 7.297
COLUMN SUMS	522 32.282 100.000	562 34.756 100.000	255 15.770 100.000	278 17.192 100.000	1617 100.000 100.000

Table 7-2 Full-Time Students Receive Priority by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION
COLUMNS = FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?

	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	214	244	131	147	736
	29.076	33.152	17.799	19.973	100.000
	41.154	43.494	50.973	52.878	45.545
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	284	287	101	103	775
	36.645	37.032	13.032	13.290	100.000
	54.615	51.159	39.300	37.050	47.958
PROPRI-ETARY	22	30	25	28	105
	20.952	28.571	23.810	26.667	100.000
	4.231	5.348	9.728	10.072	6.498
COLUMN SUMS	520	561	257	278	1616
	32.178	34.715	15.903	17.203	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-3 Full-Time Students Receive Priority by Institutional Type

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE
COLUMNS = FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?

	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	26	36	22	34	118
	22.034	30.508	18.644	28.814	100.000
	5.034	6.642	8.871	12.734	7.502
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	85	109	73	62	329
	25.836	33.131	22.188	18.845	100.000
	16.473	20.111	29.435	23.221	20.915
4 YEAR	145	143	59	53	401
	36.409	35.661	14.713	13.217	100.000
	28.295	26.384	23.790	19.850	25.493
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	227	232	79	97	635
	35.748	36.535	12.441	15.276	100.000
	43.992	42.804	31.855	36.330	40.369
NURSING	3	2	6	7	18
	16.667	11.111	33.333	38.889	100.000
	0.581	0.369	2.419	2.622	1.144
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	29	20	9	14	72
	40.278	27.778	12.500	19.444	100.000
	5.620	3.690	3.629	5.243	4.577
COLUMN SUMS	516	542	248	267	1573
	32.804	34.456	15.766	16.974	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-4 Full-Time Students Receive Priority by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	155	163	50	50	418
	37.081	38.995	11.962	11.962	100.000
	30.039	29.369	19.455	18.382	26.125
SASPAA	81	80	53	48	262
	30.916	30.534	20.229	18.321	100.000
	15.698	14.414	20.623	17.647	16.375
MASPAA	153	182	88	75	498
	30.723	36.546	17.671	15.060	100.000
	29.651	32.793	34.241	27.574	31.125
SWASPAA	40	40	25	45	150
	26.667	26.667	16.667	30.000	100.000
	7.752	7.207	9.728	16.544	9.375
RMASPAA	27	24	15	11	77
	35.065	31.169	19.481	14.286	100.000
	5.233	4.324	5.837	4.044	4.813
WASPAA	60	66	26	43	195
	30.769	33.846	13.333	22.051	100.000
	11.628	11.892	10.117	15.809	12.188
COLUMN SUMS	516	555	257	272	1600
	32.250	34.688	16.063	17.000	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 7-5 Through 7-8 "There has been an Unacceptable Amount of Deliberate Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs at my Institution"

A total of 85.3 percent of the respondents disagreed that there had "been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs" at their institution. 57.2 percent expressed strong disagreement with the statement, while 28.1 percent stated moderate disagreement (Table 7-5).

Respondents from public institutions were the most likely to agree that there had been an unacceptable amount of student abuse, while aid administrators at independent institutions were least likely to report such abuse (Table 7-6).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in perceptions of student abuse based upon institutional size. There was a noticeable tendency for respondents to report unacceptable amounts of student abuse as size increased. For example, 9.5 percent of the respondents from institutions of under 1,000 students reported unacceptable amounts of abuse, while the figure was over 25 percent for respondents from institutions of 20,000 or more students (Table 7-7).

Respondents from public community colleges with enrollments of 4,000 and over were the most likely to identify the existence of student abuse, but only 4.3 percent of this group expressed strong agreement that there had been an unacceptable amount of deliberate abuse. Respondents from independent graduate/professional schools were the least likely group to express concern about student abuse (Table 7-8).

Table 7-5 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = TOO MUCH DELIBERATE STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?

	STRONG-LY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS-AGREE	STRONG-LY DIS-AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	35	145	366	805	1351
	2.591	10.733	27.091	59.585	100.000
	77.778	65.022	71.206	76.886	73.866
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	2	29	53	80	164
	1.220	17.683	32.317	48.780	100.000
	4.444	11.009	10.311	7.641	8.967
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	2	26	64	88	180
	1.111	14.444	35.556	48.889	100.000
	4.444	11.659	12.451	8.405	9.841
OTHER	6	23	31	74	134
	4.478	17.164	23.134	55.224	100.000
	13.333	10.314	6.031	7.068	7.326
COLUMN SUMS	45	223	514	1047	1829
	2.460	12.192	28.103	57.244	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-6 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION

COLUMNS = TOO MUCH DELIBERATE STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	32	139	249	356	776
	4.124	17.912	32.088	45.876	100.000
	71.111	61.778	48.633	34.034	42.451
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	10	68	222	606	906
	1.104	7.506	24.503	66.887	100.000
	22.222	30.222	43.359	57.935	49.562
PROPRIETARY	3	18	41	84	146
	2.055	12.329	28.082	57.534	100.000
	6.667	8.000	8.008	8.031	7.987
COLUMN SUMS	45	225	512	1046	1828
	2.462	12.309	28.009	57.221	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-7 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = TOO MUCH DELIBERATE STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	7	50	141	401	599
	1.169	8.347	23.539	66.945	100.000
	15.909	22.124	27.539	38.300	32.750
1000-3999	12	62	158	309	541
	2.218	11.460	29.205	57.116	100.000
	27.273	27.434	30.859	29.513	29.579
4000-9999	9	48	88	155	300
	3.000	16.000	29.333	51.667	100.000
	20.455	21.239	17.188	14.804	16.402
10,000-19,999	8	32	71	113	224
	3.571	14.286	31.696	50.446	100.000
	18.182	14.159	13.867	10.793	12.247
20,000+	8	34	54	69	165
	4.848	20.606	32.727	41.818	100.000
	18.182	15.044	10.547	6.590	9.021
COLUMN SUMS	44	226	512	1047	1829
	2.406	12.356	27.993	57.248	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-8 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE

COLUMNS = TOO MUCH DELIBERATE STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	6	17	39	44	106
4 YEAR+	5.660	16.038	36.792	41.509	100.000
<7000	13.636	7.798	7.847	4.301	5.948
PUBLIC	7	16	46	65	134
4 YEAR+	5.224	11.940	34.328	48.507	100.000
7-19999	15.909	7.339	9.256	6.358	7.520
PUBLIC	4	20	40	51	115
4 YEAR+	3.478	17.391	34.783	44.348	100.000
20,000+	9.091	9.174	8.048	4.985	6.453
PUBLIC		10	14	16	40
4 YEAR		25.000	35.000	40.000	100.000
<4000		4.587	2.817	1.564	2.245
PUBLIC		6	8	15	29
4 YEAR		20.690	27.586	51.724	100.000
4,000+		2.752	1.610	1.466	1.627
PUBLIC	4	20	36	55	115
2 YEAR	3.478	17.391	31.304	47.826	100.000
<4000	9.091	9.174	7.243	5.376	6.453
PUBLIC	5	32	34	45	116
2 YEAR	4.310	27.586	29.310	38.793	100.000
4,000+	11.364	14.679	6.841	4.399	6.510
PUBLIC,	2	1	6	22	31
GRAD/	6.452	3.226	19.355	70.968	100.000
PROF	4.545	0.459	1.207	2.151	1.740
INDEP	2	11	40	103	156
4 YEAR+	1.282	7.051	25.641	66.026	100.000
<4000	4.545	5.046	8.048	10.068	8.754
INDEP	1	16	42	84	143
4 YEAR+	0.699	11.189	29.371	58.741	100.000
4,000+	2.273	7.339	8.451	8.211	8.025
INDEP	2	10	36	134	182
4 YEAR	1.099	5.495	19.780	73.626	100.000
<1000	4.545	4.587	7.243	13.099	10.213
INDEP	3	12	35	87	137
4 YEAR	2.190	8.759	25.547	63.504	100.000
1-1,999	6.818	5.505	7.042	8.504	7.688
INDEP		6	15	34	55
4 YEAR		10.909	27.273	61.818	100.000
2,000+		2.752	3.018	3.324	3.086
INDEP		5	18	47	70
2 YEAR		7.143	25.714	67.143	100.000
		2.294	3.622	4.594	3.928
INDEP	2	2	25	74	103
GRAD/	1.942	1.942	24.272	71.845	100.000
PROF	4.545	0.917	5.030	7.234	5.780
PUBLIC&		3	6	26	35
INDEP		8.571	17.143	74.286	100.000
NURSING		1.376	1.207	2.542	1.964
PUBLIC&	3	13	16	37	69
INDEP	4.348	18.841	23.188	53.623	100.000
VOC.TEC	6.818	5.963	3.219	3.617	3.872
PROPRI.	2	9	26	49	86
VOC.TEC	2.326	10.465	30.233	56.977	100.000
	4.545	4.128	5.231	4.790	4.826
ALL	1	9	15	35	60
OTHER	1.667	15.000	25.000	58.333	100.000
PROPRI.	2.273	4.128	3.018	3.421	3.367
COLUMN SUMS	44	218	497	1023	1782
	2.469	12.233	27.890	57.407	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 7-9 Through 7-14 "There Should be a Formal Certification Process for Financial Aid Administrators"

The question of "to certify, or not to certify" has received a great deal of attention, especially in the past several years. Over three-fourths of the respondents were in favor of a formal certification process for financial aid administrators. Slightly more than one-third of the respondents said they "strongly" agreed with the need for certification of aid administrators. There were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 level) in responses based on title (see Table 7-9), race, sex, or institutional size.

Support for certification of aid administrators was strongest among those with between 4 to 10 years of financial aid experience (approximately 80 percent were in favor of certification). On the other hand, almost one-half of the respondents with over 16 years of experience were opposed to certification. Differences in responses based on length of employment in financial aid were significant at the .01 level (Table 7-10).

Significant differences (at the .01 level) were also apparent based upon respondents' level of education. Holders of the Ph.D. were approximately twice as likely to disagree with the need for certification as were other respondents (Table 7-11).

Although respondents from the three major categories of institutions (public, independent, proprietary) overwhelmingly supported the need for certification, respondents from public institutions expressed the highest levels of support (Table 7-12). Over 70 percent of the respondents from 4 out of the 6 categories of institutional type (vocational/technical, 2-year, 4-year college, and university) expressed support for certification. The strongest support came from respondents in the vocational/technical area, while respondents from graduate/professional schools expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with certification (Table 7-13).

No area of the country had less than 70 percent of its respondents favoring a certification process for aid administrators. The most dissatisfaction with certification was found in the EASFAA region, while over 80 percent of the respondents in 4 out of the 5 remaining regions supported certification (Table 7-14).

Table 7-9 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	871 35.176 76.137	568 42.920 74.443	196 14.638 68.531	104 7.767 69.333	1339 100.000 73.733
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	55 33.951 8.914	62 38.272 8.126	28 17.284 9.790	17 10.494 11.333	162 100.000 8.921
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	53 28.962 8.590	79 43.169 10.354	36 19.672 12.587	15 8.197 10.000	183 100.000 10.077
OTHER	38 28.788 6.159	54 40.909 7.077	26 19.697 9.091	14 10.606 9.333	132 100.000 7.269
COLUMN SUMS	617 33.976 100.000	763 42.015 100.000	286 15.749 100.000	150 8.260 100.000	1816 100.000 100.000

Table 7-10 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS EXPER.	72 29.876 11.632	101 41.909 13.255	56 23.237 19.580	12 4.979 8.000	241 100.000 13.258
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	95 28.190 15.347	153 45.401 20.079	53 15.727 18.531	36 10.682 24.000	337 100.000 18.547
4-5 YEARS	154 42.308 24.879	142 39.011 18.635	46 12.637 16.084	22 6.044 14.667	364 100.000 20.033
6-10 YEARS	218 37.012 35.218	247 41.935 32.415	75 12.733 26.224	49 8.319 32.667	589 100.000 32.416
11-15 YEARS	71 30.870 11.470	99 43.043 12.992	43 18.696 15.035	17 7.391 11.333	230 100.000 12.658
16+ YEARS	9 16.071 1.454	20 35.714 2.625	13 23.214 4.545	14 25.000 9.333	56 100.000 3.082
COLUMN SUMS	619 34.067 100.000	762 41.937 100.000	286 15.740 100.000	150 8.255 100.000	1817 100.000 100.000

Table 7-11 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Educational Level

ROWS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	24	30	20	22	96
	25.000	31.250	20.833	22.917	100.000
	1.883	3.937	6.993	14.966	5.295
MASTERS	302	371	147	62	922
	37.093	40.239	15.944	6.725	100.000
	55.340	48.688	51.399	42.177	50.855
BACHELORS	168	244	76	45	533
	31.520	45.779	14.259	8.443	100.000
	27.184	32.021	26.573	30.612	29.399
ASSOCIATE	29	29	12	6	76
	38.158	38.158	15.789	7.895	100.000
	4.693	3.806	4.196	4.082	4.192
OTHER	55	88	31	12	186
	29.570	47.312	16.667	6.452	100.000
	8.900	11.549	10.839	8.163	10.259
COLUMN SUMS	618	762	286	147	1813
	34.087	42.030	15.775	8.108	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-12 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Institutional Control

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	294	345	92	52	783
	37.548	44.061	11.750	6.641	100.000
	47.573	45.335	32.394	34.667	43.188
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	271	362	164	88	885
	30.621	40.904	18.531	9.944	100.000
	43.851	47.569	57.746	58.667	48.814
PROPRIETARY	53	54	28	10	145
	36.552	37.241	19.310	6.897	100.000
	8.576	7.096	9.859	6.667	7.998
COLUMN SUMS	618	761	284	150	1813
	34.087	41.975	15.665	8.274	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-13 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Institutional Type

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	64	59	28	8	159
	40.252	37.107	17.610	5.031	100.000
	10.667	7.973	10.036	5.479	9.008
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	135	163	44	13	355
	38.028	45.915	12.394	3.662	100.000
	22.500	22.027	15.771	8.904	20.113
4 YEAR	145	189	78	32	440
	32.955	42.955	16.818	7.273	100.000
	24.167	25.541	26.523	21.918	24.929
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	221	262	104	64	651
	33.948	40.246	15.975	9.831	100.000
	36.833	35.405	37.276	43.836	36.884
NURSING	11	13	4	7	35
	31.429	37.143	11.429	20.000	100.000
	1.833	1.757	1.434	4.795	1.983
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	24	54	25	22	125
	19.200	43.200	20.000	17.600	100.000
	4.000	7.297	8.961	15.068	7.082
COLUMN SUMS	600	740	279	146	1765
	33.994	41.926	15.807	8.272	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-14 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Geographic Area

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	156	197	91	53	497
	31.388	39.638	18.310	10.664	100.000
	25.532	26.024	32.500	36.054	27.688
SASFAA	109	119	37	15	280
	38.929	42.500	13.214	5.357	100.000
	17.840	15.720	13.214	10.204	15.599
MASFAA	170	243	81	47	541
	31.423	44.917	14.972	8.688	100.000
	27.823	32.100	28.929	31.973	30.139
SWASFAA	72	62	25	8	167
	43.114	37.126	14.970	4.790	100.000
	11.784	8.190	8.929	5.442	9.304
RMASFAA	26	43	12	4	85
	30.588	50.588	14.118	4.706	100.000
	4.255	5.680	4.286	2.721	4.735
WASFAA	78	93	34	20	225
	34.667	41.333	15.111	8.889	100.000
	12.766	12.285	12.143	13.605	12.535
COLUMN SUMS	611	757	280	147	1795
	34.039	42.173	15.599	8.189	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section D

Office Characteristics

TABLES 8-1 Through 8-13 Staff Size and Adequacy of Staff

Tables 8-1 through 8-3 display office staffing patterns for the following positions: professional, clerical, and student assistants. If the number of respondents in an institutional category exceeded 100, the category was further divided by institutional size. Responses are only included from respondents indicating that they work in the "central" financial aid office on their campus.

It was originally anticipated that staffing patterns would be compared with the "size of the setting" in which the respondent worked (branch campus, central campus, academic department, etc.). However, over 59 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey did not indicate "size of setting." As a result, the following tables compare "staff size" with "institutional size" for respondents stating that they are employed in the "central" financial aid office on their campus. Although this approach produces a number of anomalies, it produces accurate results for the majority of the respondents. It should also be noted that a number of respondents apparently included other staff members, besides those in the Financial Aid Office in their staff size. As a result, several respondents state that they are employed at small institutions and yet they have staffs that would be more appropriate for larger institutions. At the other extreme, some respondents from large institutions replied that they had either no staff or very small staffs. Many of these respondents are probably employed in staff positions above the Financial Aid Office and may have only reported the Director of Financial Aid as someone reporting to them. In summary, the figures on staff size are questionable for several reasons and responses which are extremely high or low should, in all probability, be deleted. However, if the figures are interpreted carefully, they do provide a reasonable approximation of staffing patterns.

Table 8-1 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Professional Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZ

COLUMNS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF

	NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	1	38	41	5	1			88
4 YEAR+	2.381	1.190	45.476	48.810	5.952	1.190			100.000
<7000	6.897	3.226	6.104	13.487	4.630	2.273			7.602
PUBLIC			4	39	42	9	1	1	96
4 YEAR+			4.167	40.625	43.750	9.375	1.042	1.042	100.000
7-19999			0.718	12.829	38.889	20.455	5.882	6.667	8.688
PUBLIC	3		1	6	12	13	10	8	53
4 YEAR+	5.660		1.887	11.321	22.642	24.528	18.868	15.094	100.000
20,000+	10.345		0.180	1.974	11.111	29.545	58.824	53.333	4.796
PUBLIC			20	11					31
4 YEAR			64.516	35.484					100.000
<4000			3.591	3.618					2.805
PUBLIC			4	8	9	2	1		24
4 YEAR			16.667	33.333	37.500	8.333	4.167		100.000
4,000+			0.718	2.632	8.333	4.545	5.882		2.172
PUBLIC	6		50	11					67
2 YEAR	8.955		74.627	16.418					100.000
<4000	20.690		8.977	3.618					6.063
PUBLIC	2		37	25	7	2			73
2 YEAR	2.740		50.685	34.247	9.589	2.740			100.000
4,000+	6.897		6.643	8.224	6.481	4.545			6.606
PUBLIC,			3	3					6
GRAD/			50.000	50.000					100.000
PROF			0.539	0.987					0.543
INDEP	2	6	58	36	4	2			108
4 YEAR+	1.852	5.556	53.704	33.333	3.704	1.852			100.000
<4000	6.897	19.355	10.413	11.842	3.704	4.545			9.774
INDEP			6	29	21	13	4	3	76
4 YEAR+			7.895	38.158	27.632	17.105	5.263	3.947	100.000
4,000+			1.077	9.539	19.444	29.545	23.529	20.000	6.878
INDEP	3	6	103	19					131
4 YEAR	2.290	4.580	78.626	14.504					100.000
<1000	10.345	19.355	18.492	6.250					11.855
INDEP	3	5	78	29	2				117
4 YEAR	2.564	4.274	66.667	24.786	1.709				100.000
1-1,999	10.345	16.129	14.004	9.539	1.852				10.588
INDEP		1	20	14	2				37
4 YEAR		2.703	54.054	37.838	5.405				100.000
2,000+		3.226	3.591	4.605	1.852				3.348
INDEP	1	2	34	3			1		41
2 YEAR	2.439	4.878	82.927	7.317			2.439		100.000
	3.448	6.452	6.104	0.987			5.882		3.710
INDEP	1	1	16	3					21
GRAD/	4.762	4.762	76.190	14.286					100.000
PROF	3.448	3.226	2.873	0.987					1.900
PUBLIC&	1		10						11
INDEP	9.091		90.909						100.000
NURSING	3.448		1.795						0.995
PUBLIC&	1	2	25	6		1			35
INDEP	2.857	5.714	71.429	17.143		2.857			100.000
VOC.TEC	3.448	6.452	4.488	1.974		2.273			3.167
PROPRI.	2	4	33	14	2	1		2	58
VOC.TEC	3.448	6.897	56.897	24.138	3.448	1.724		3.448	100.000
	6.897	12.903	5.925	4.605	1.852	2.273		13.333	5.249
ALL	2	3	21	7	2			1	36
OTHER	5.556	8.333	58.333	19.444	5.556			2.778	100.000
PROPRI.	6.897	9.677	3.770	2.303	1.852			6.667	3.258
COLUMN	29	31	557	304	108	44	17	15	1105
SUMS	2.624	2.805	50.407	27.511	9.774	3.982	1.538	1.357	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-2 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Clerical Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

	NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	3	24	42	12	1			84
4 YEAR+	2.381	3.571	28.571	50.000	14.286	1.190			100.000
<7000	2.532	4.348	5.381	13.816	9.677	3.030			7.616
PUBLIC	1		3	23	52	8	8		95
4 YEAR+	1.053		3.158	24.211	54.737	8.421	8.421		100.000
7-19999	1.266		0.673	7.566	41.935	24.242	26.667		8.613
PUBLIC	3			6	6	11	14	12	52
4 YEAR+	5.769			11.538	11.538	21.154	26.923	23.077	100.000
20,000+	3.797			1.974	4.839	33.333	46.667	66.667	4.714
PUBLIC		3	16	9	3				31
4 YEAR		9.677	51.613	29.032	9.677				100.000
<4000		4.348	3.587	2.961	2.419				2.811
PUBLIC			5	9	7	2	1		24
4 YEAR			20.833	37.500	29.167	8.333	4.167		100.000
4,000+			1.121	2.961	5.645	6.061	3.333		2.176
PUBLIC	4	3	42	17	1				67
2 YEAR	5.970	4.478	62.687	25.373	1.493				100.000
<4000	5.063	4.348	9.417	5.592	0.806				6.074
PUBLIC	3	1	19	36	10	2	2		73
2 YEAR	4.110	1.370	26.027	49.315	13.699	2.740	2.740		100.000
4,000+	3.797	1.449	4.260	11.842	8.065	6.061	6.667		6.618
PUBLIC,		1	4	1					6
GRAD/		16.667	66.667	16.667					100.000
PROF		1.449	0.897	0.329					0.544
INDEP	6	5	68	30	2	1			108
4 YEAR+	5.556	4.630	59.259	27.778	1.852	0.926			100.000
<4000	7.595	7.246	18.350	9.868	1.613	3.030			9.791
INDEP		1	10	25	21	8	5	6	76
4 YEAR+		1.316	13.158	32.895	27.632	10.526	6.579	7.895	100.000
4,000+		1.449	2.242	8.224	16.935	24.242	16.667	33.333	6.890
INDEP	25	12	79	12	3				131
4 YEAR	19.084	9.160	60.305	9.160	2.290				100.000
<1000	31.646	17.391	17.713	3.947	2.419				11.877
INDEP	6	6	68	35	2				117
4 YEAR	5.128	5.128	58.120	29.915	1.709				100.000
1-1,999	7.595	8.696	15.247	11.513	1.613				10.607
INDEP	1		21	15					37
4 YEAR	2.703		56.757	40.541					100.000
2,000+	1.266		4.709	4.934					3.354
INDEP	6	8	20	7					41
2 YEAR	14.634	19.512	48.780	17.073					100.000
	7.595	11.594	4.484	2.303					3.717
INDEP	2	1	15	3					21
GRAD/	9.524	4.762	71.429	14.286					100.000
PROF	2.532	1.449	3.363	0.987					1.904
PUBLIC&	1	3	6	1					11
INDEP	9.091	27.273	54.545	9.091					100.000
NURSING	1.266	4.348	1.345	0.329					0.997
PUBLIC&		6	16	12	1				35
INDEP		17.143	45.714	34.286	2.857				100.000
VOC.TEC		8.696	3.587	3.947	0.806				3.173
PROPRI.	11	12	20	11	4				58
VOC.TEC	18.966	20.690	34.483	18.966	6.897				100.000
	13.924	17.391	4.484	3.618	3.226				5.258
ALL	8	4	14	10					36
OTHER	22.222	11.111	38.889	27.778					100.000
PROPRI.	10.127	5.797	3.139	3.289					3.264
COLUMN	79	69	446	304	124	33	30	18	1103
SUMS	7.162	6.256	40.435	27.561	11.242	2.992	2.720	1.632	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-3 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Student Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE

COLUMNS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME STUDENT ASSISTANTS STAFF

	NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	4	8	15	22	27	4	3	1	84
4 YEAR+	4.762	9.524	17.857	26.190	32.143	4.762	3.571	1.190	100.000
<7000	2.597	4.469	6.944	7.358	19.708	8.889	6.383	4.167	7.629
PUBLIC	3	1	6	28	19	18	16	5	96
4 YEAR+	3.125	1.042	6.250	29.167	19.792	18.750	16.667	5.208	100.000
7-19999	1.948	0.559	2.778	9.365	13.869	40.000	34.043	20.833	8.719
PUBLIC	3	1	2	5	10	5	13	11	50
4 YEAR+	6.000	2.000	4.000	10.000	20.000	10.000	26.000	22.000	100.000
20,000+	1.948	0.559	0.926	1.672	7.299	11.111	27.660	45.833	4.541
PUBLIC	2	3	4	13	9				31
4 YEAR	6.452	9.677	12.903	41.935	29.032				100.000
<4000	1.299	1.676	1.852	4.348	6.569				2.816
PUBLIC		1	2	7	8	3	2	1	24
4 YEAR		4.167	8.333	29.167	33.333	12.500	8.333	4.167	100.000
4,000+		0.559	0.926	2.341	5.839	6.667	4.255	4.167	2.180
PUBLIC	13	12	17	20	4		1		67
2 YEAR	19.403	17.910	25.373	29.851	5.970		1.493		100.000
<4000	8.442	6.704	7.870	6.689	2.920		2.128		6.085
PUBLIC	7	5	11	32	13	1		4	73
2 YEAR	9.589	6.849	15.068	43.836	17.808	1.370		5.479	100.000
4,000+	4.545	2.793	5.093	10.702	9.489	2.222		16.667	6.630
PUBLIC,	2	4							6
GRAD/	33.333	66.667							100.000
PROF	1.299	2.235							0.545
INDEP	15	14	28	40	9	1	1		108
4 YEAR+	13.889	12.963	25.926	37.037	8.333	0.926	0.926		100.000
<4000	9.740	7.821	12.963	13.378	6.569	2.222	2.128		9.809
INDEP	6	4	13	23	14	8	5	2	75
4 YEAR+	8.000	5.333	17.333	30.667	18.667	10.667	6.667	2.667	100.000
4,000+	3.896	2.235	6.019	7.692	10.219	17.778	10.638	8.333	6.812
INDEP	24	21	43	33	5	2	3		131
4 YEAR	18.321	16.031	32.824	25.191	3.817	1.527	2.290		100.000
<1000	15.584	11.732	19.907	11.037	3.650	4.444	6.383		11.898
INDEP	18	23	32	40	6	1	1		117
4 YEAR	11.966	19.658	27.350	34.188	5.128	0.855	0.855		100.000
1-1,999	9.091	12.849	14.815	13.378	4.380	2.222	2.128		10.627
INDEP	3	2	10	16	4	1	1		37
4 YEAR	8.108	5.405	27.027	43.243	10.811	2.703	2.703		100.000
2,000+	1.948	1.117	4.630	5.351	2.920	2.222	2.128		3.361
INDEP	7	12	12	7	2	1			41
2 YEAR	17.073	29.268	29.268	17.073	4.878	2.439			100.000
	4.545	6.704	5.556	2.341	1.460	2.222			3.724
INDEP	6	6	3	4	2				21
GRAD/	28.571	28.571	14.286	19.048	9.524				100.000
PROF	3.896	3.352	1.389	1.338	1.460				1.907
PUBLIC&	6	5							11
INDEP	54.545	45.455							100.000
NURSING	3.896	2.793							0.999
PUBLIC&	5	13	10	3	3		1		35
INDEP	14.286	37.143	28.571	8.571	8.571		2.857		100.000
VOC.TEC	3.247	7.263	4.630	1.003	2.190		2.128		3.179
PROPRI.	24	24	5	4	1				58
VOC.TEC	41.379	41.379	8.621	6.897	1.724				100.000
	15.584	13.408	2.315	1.338	0.730				5.268
ALL	10	20	3	2	1				36
OTHER	27.778	55.556	8.333	5.556	2.778				100.000
PROPRI.	6.494	11.173	1.389	0.669	0.730				3.270
COLUMN	154	179	216	299	137	45	47	24	1101
SUMS	13.987	16.258	19.619	27.157	12.443	4.087	4.269	2.180	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-4 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (Under 1,000)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = UNDER 1000

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1	6	1	3	11
	9.091	54.545	9.091	27.273	100.000
	1.515	5.310	1.163	4.167	3.264
1	2	6	5	5	18
	11.111	33.333	27.778	27.778	100.000
	3.030	5.310	5.814	6.944	5.341
2-3	47	81	66	59	253
	18.577	32.016	26.087	23.320	100.000
	71.212	71.681	76.744	81.944	75.074
4-6	13	17	12	5	47
	27.660	36.170	25.532	10.638	100.000
	19.697	15.044	13.953	6.944	13.947
7-9		2			2
		100.000			100.000
		1.770			0.593
10-14	1	1			2
	50.000	50.000			100.000
	1.515	0.885			0.593
15-19	1				1
	100.000				100.000
	1.515				0.297
20+	1		2		3
	33.333		66.667		100.000
	1.515		2.326		0.890
COL SUMS	66	113	86	72	337
	19.585	33.531	25.519	21.365	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-5 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (1,000-3,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 1000-3999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1	7	3		11
	9.091	63.636	27.273		100.000
	3.125	5.344	2.857		2.842
1		4	5	3	12
		33.333	41.667	25.000	100.000
		3.053	4.762	2.521	3.101
2-3	13	66	65	89	233
	5.579	28.326	27.897	38.197	100.000
	40.625	50.382	61.905	74.790	60.207
4-6	12	48	31	27	118
	10.169	40.678	26.271	22.881	100.000
	37.500	36.641	29.524	22.689	30.491
7-9	5	5	1		11
	45.455	45.455	9.091		100.000
	15.625	3.817	0.952		2.842
10-14	1	1			2
	50.000	50.000			100.000
	3.125	0.763			0.517
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	32	131	105	119	387
	8.269	33.850	27.132	30.749	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-6 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (4,000-9,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 4000-9999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1		2		3
	33.333		66.667		100.000
	4.545		3.125		1.389
1	1				1
	100.000				100.000
	4.545				0.463
2-3	3	18	14	29	60
	5.000	23.333	23.333	48.333	100.000
	13.636	24.561	21.875	39.726	27.778
4-6	8	26	35	32	101
	7.921	25.743	34.653	31.683	100.000
	36.364	45.614	54.688	43.836	46.759
7-9	6	14	12	11	43
	13.953	32.558	27.907	25.581	100.000
	27.273	[illegible]	18.750	15.068	19.907
10-14	3	3	1	1	8
	37.500	37.500	12.500	12.500	100.000
	13.636	5.263	1.563	1.370	3.704
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	22	57	64	73	216
	10.185	26.389	29.630	33.796	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-7 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (10,000-19,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 10,000-19,999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE					
1				1	1
				100.000	100.000
				2.041	0.763
2-3	5	8	3	11	27
	18.519	29.630	11.111	40.741	100.000
	33.333	22.857	9.375	22.449	20.611
4-6	4	9	12	15	40
	10.000	22.500	30.000	37.500	100.000
	26.667	25.714	37.500	30.612	30.534
7-9	1	8	14	18	41
	2.439	19.512	34.146	43.902	100.000
	6.667	22.857	43.750	36.735	31.298
10-14	3	8	3	3	17
	17.647	47.059	17.647	17.647	100.000
	20.000	22.857	9.375	6.122	12.977
15-19	2	1		1	4
	50.000	25.000		25.000	100.000
	13.333	2.857		2.041	3.053
20+		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		2.857			0.763
COL SUMS	15	35	32	49	131
	11.450	26.718	24.427	37.405	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-8 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (20,000 and over)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 20,000+

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE		1 50.000 3.704	1 50.000 5.000		2 100.000 2.817
1					
2-3		2 33.333 7.407	2 33.333 10.000	2 33.333 11.765	6 100.000 8.451
4-6	1 9.091 14.286	4 36.364 14.815	2 18.182 10.000	4 36.364 23.529	11 100.000 15.493
7-9	2 14.286 28.571	4 28.571 14.815	4 28.571 20.000	4 28.571 23.529	14 100.000 19.718
10-14	4 26.667 57.143	5 33.333 18.519	5 33.333 25.000	1 6.667 5.882	15 100.000 21.127
15-19		5 41.667 18.519	4 33.333 20.000	3 25.000 17.647	12 100.000 16.901
20+		6 54.545 22.222	2 18.182 10.000	3 27.273 17.647	11 100.000 15.493
COL SUMS	7 9.859 100.000	27 38.028 100.000	20 28.169 100.000	17 23.944 100.000	71 100.000 100.000

Table 8-9 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (Under 1,000)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = UNDER 1000

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	11	20	13	9	53
	20.755	37.736	24.528	16.981	100.000
	16.667	17.857	15.116	12.500	15.774
1	4	8	12	26	50
	8.000	16.000	24.000	52.000	100.000
	6.061	7.143	13.953	36.111	14.881
2-3	35	66	53	31	185
	18.919	35.676	28.649	16.757	100.000
	53.030	58.929	61.628	43.056	55.060
4-6	14	16	5	6	41
	34.146	39.024	12.195	14.634	100.000
	21.212	14.286	5.814	8.333	12.202
7-9	2	2	3		7
	28.571	28.571	42.857		100.000
	1.030	1.786	3.488		2.083
10-14					
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	66	112	86	72	336
	19.643	33.333	25.595	21.429	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-10 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (1,000-3,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 1000-3999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	2	7	5	6	20
	10.000	35.000	25.000	30.000	100.000
	6.250	5.344	4.762	5.042	5.168
1			5	10	15
			33.333	66.667	100.000
			4.762	8.403	3.876
2-3	18	65	54	78	215
	8.372	30.233	25.116	36.279	100.000
	56.250	49.618	51.429	65.546	55.556
4-6	9	53	39	25	126
	7.143	42.063	30.952	19.841	100.000
	28.125	40.458	37.143	21.008	32.558
7-9	2	6	2		10
	20.000	60.000	20.000		100.000
	6.250	4.580	1.905		2.584
10-14	1				1
	100.000				100.000
	3.125				0.258
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	32	131	105	119	387
	8.269	33.850	27.132	30.749	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-11 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (4,000-9,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 4000-9999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE			1	2	3
			33.333	66.667	100.000
			1.563	2.740	1.389
1	1			2	3
	33.333			66.667	100.000
	4.545			2.740	1.389
2-3	2	13	7	21	43
	4.651	30.233	16.279	48.837	100.000
	9.091	22.807	10.938	28.767	19.907
4-6	11	24	32	34	101
	10.891	23.762	31.683	33.663	100.000
	50.000	42.105	50.000	46.575	46.759
7-9	6	16	21	12	55
	10.909	29.091	38.182	21.818	100.000
	27.273	28.070	32.813	16.438	25.463
10-14	1	4	3	1	9
	11.111	44.444	33.333	11.111	100.000
	4.545	7.018	4.688	1.370	4.167
15-19	1			1	2
	50.000			50.000	100.000
	4.545			1.370	0.926
20+					
COL SUMS	22	57	64	73	216
	10.185	26.389	29.630	33.796	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-12 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (10,000-19,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 10,000-19,999

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1		2		3
	33.333		66.667		100.000
	6.667		6.250		2.308
1				2	2
				100.000	100.000
				4.082	1.538
2-3	4	5	1	7	17
	23.529	29.412	5.882	41.176	100.000
	26.667	14.706	3.125	14.286	13.077
4-6	2	9	10	14	35
	5.714	25.714	28.571	40.000	100.000
	13.333	26.471	31.250	28.571	26.923
7-9	3	13	16	16	48
	6.250	27.083	33.333	33.333	100.000
	20.000	38.235	50.000	32.653	36.923
10-14	1	2	1	7	11
	9.091	18.182	9.091	63.636	100.000
	6.667	5.882	3.125	14.286	8.462
15-19	3	3	2	3	11
	27.273	27.273	18.182	27.273	100.000
	20.000	8.824	6.250	6.122	8.462
20+	1	2			3
	33.333	66.667			100.000
	6.667	5.882			2.308
COL SUMS	15	34	32	49	130
	11.538	26.154	24.615	37.692	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-13 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (20,000 and over)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 20,000+

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?

	STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	MODER. DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		3.846			1.429
1					
2-3	1		1	2	4
	25.000		25.000	50.000	100.000
	14.286		5.000	11.765	5.714
4-6	1	6	2	4	13
	7.692	46.154	15.385	30.769	100.000
	14.286	23.077	10.000	23.529	18.571
7-9		5	2	2	9
		55.556	22.222	22.222	100.000
		19.231	10.000	11.765	12.857
10-14	2	3	4	2	11
	18.182	27.273	36.364	18.182	100.000
	28.571	11.538	20.000	11.765	15.714
15-19	2	1	10	4	17
	11.765	5.882	58.824	23.529	100.000
	28.571	3.846	50.000	23.529	24.286
20+	1	10	1	3	15
	6.667	66.667	6.667	20.000	100.000
	14.286	38.462	5.000	17.647	21.429
COL SUMS	7	26	20	17	70
	10.000	37.143	28.571	24.286	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 9-1 Through 9-3 "What is the Title of Your Immediate Supervisor?"*

Directors of financial aid reported a wide variety of immediate supervisors. As seen in Tables 9-1, 9-2, and 9-3, reporting arrangements tend to vary by type of institution and by institutional size.

Directors at small institutions (under 1,000 students) were more likely to report directly to the President or Chancellor than were those at other institutions.

Among Directors from public institutions (Table 9-1), the most common reporting arrangement was to the Dean of Students (38.4%), followed by the Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs (28.9%). At private institutions (Table 9-2), Directors were more likely to report to the Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs (19.3%) than were Directors at public institutions.

Directors at proprietary institutions (Table 9-3) were more likely to report directly to the President than were Directors at other types of institutions.

---

*Respondents were given a choice of 15 supervisor's titles to select. Very few responses (less than 1%) were made in several of the title categories. Therefore, a number of the little-used categories were collapsed into related categories:

1. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs/Treasurer includes Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Business Affairs as well as Controllers/Comptrollers.

2. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs includes Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs as well as Deans of Academic Affairs.

3. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Student Affairs includes Associate/Assistant Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs.

Table 9-1 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Public Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: = PUBLIC

TITLE = DIREC-TOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = TITLE OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

	PRES.OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS.AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD.AF	VICE CH OR V.P. STUD.AF	DEAN OF STU-DENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS.& FIN.AID	DIR. OF ADMIS-SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI-STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	8	2	1	2	9		1		15	38
	21.053	5.263	2.632	5.263	23.684		2.632		39.474	100.000
	32.000	9.091	10.000	1.449	4.918		14.286		17.647	7.983
1000-3999	10	5	1	23	65		1		19	124
	8.065	4.032	0.806	18.548	52.419		0.806		15.323	100.000
	40.000	22.727	10.000	16.667	35.519		14.286		22.353	26.050
4000-9999	4	12	4	50	52	2	3	2	22	151
	2.649	7.947	2.649	33.113	34.437	1.325	1.987	1.325	14.570	100.000
	16.000	54.545	40.000	36.232	28.415	66.667	42.857	66.667	25.882	31.723
10,000-19,999	3	2	1	40	35	1			12	94
	3.191	2.128	1.064	42.553	37.234	1.064			12.766	100.000
	12.000	9.091	10.000	28.986	19.126	33.333			14.118	19.748
20,000+		1	3	23	22		2	1	17	69
		1.449	4.348	33.333	31.884		2.899	1.449	24.638	100.000
		4.545	30.000	16.667	12.022		28.571	33.333	20.000	14.496
COLUMN SUMS	25	22	10	138	183	3	7	3	85	476
	5.252	4.622	2.101	28.992	38.445	0.630	1.471	0.630	17.857	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 9-2 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Independent Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION = INDEP. (PRI-VATE)

TITLE = DIREC-TOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE SHORT CODE

COLUMNS = TITLE OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

	PRES.OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS.AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD.AF	VICE CH OR V.P. STUD.AF	DEAN OF STU-DENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS.& FIN.AID	DIR. OF ADMIS-SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI-STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	44	41	18	7	37	2	25	5	44	223
	19.731	18.386	8.072	3.139	16.592	0.897	11.211	2.242	19.731	100.000
	58.667	36.937	48.649	12.069	16.275	9.091	59.524	83.333	36.066	38.783
1000-3999	28	54	13	24	56	11	15	1	45	247
	11.336	21.862	5.263	9.717	22.672	4.453	6.073	0.405	18.219	100.000
	37.333	48.649	35.135	41.379	54.902	50.000	35.714	16.667	36.885	42.957
4000-9999	3	7	4	17	8	3	1		21	64
	4.688	10.938	6.250	26.563	12.500	4.688	1.563		32.813	100.000
	4.000	6.306	10.811	29.310	7.843	13.636	2.381		17.213	11.130
10,000-19,999		8	2	10	1	5	1		9	36
		22.222	5.556	27.778	2.778	13.889	2.778		25.000	100.000
		7.207	5.405	17.241	0.980	22.727	2.381		7.377	6.261
20,000+		1				1			3	5
		20.000				20.000			60.000	100.000
		0.901				4.545			2.459	0.870
COLUMN SUMS	75	111	37	58	102	22	42	6	122	575
	13.043	19.304	6.435	10.087	17.739	3.826	7.304	1.043	21.217	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 9-3 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Proprietary Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: = PROPRIETARY

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = TITLE OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

	PRES.OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS.AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD.AF	VICE CH OR V.P. STUD.AF	DEAN OF STU-DENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS.& FIN.AID	DIR. OF ADMIS-SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI-STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	47 60.256 87.037	1 1.282 33.333	1 1.282 100.000	2 2.564 50.000	1 1.282 25.000		1 1.282 100.000	9 11.538 100.000	16 20.513 88.889	78 100.000 82.979
1000-3999	6 46.154 11.111	1 7.692 33.333		2 15.385 50.000	2 15.385 50.000				2 15.385 11.111	13 100.000 13.830
4000-9999		1 100.000 33.333								1 100.000 1.064
10,000-19,999	1 50.000 1.852				1 50.000 25.000					2 100.000 2.128
20,000+										
COLUMN SUMS	54 57.447 100.000	3 3.191 100.000	1 1.064 100.000	4 4.255 100.000	4 4.255 100.000		1 1.064 100.000	9 9.574 100.000	18 19.149 100.000	94 100.000 100.000

TABLES 10-1 Through 10-3 Office Responsibility for Student Employment

Approximately one-third of the respondents fell into each of the following two categories:

> ...office is responsible for both finding positions for College Work-Study students and placing them in these positions
>
> ...office is responsible for finding positions and/or placing students in positions for both the CWS program and other student employment programs (Table 10-1).

There were noticeable differences between the responses of individuals from proprietary schools and other groups. Respondents from proprietary schools were more likely to indicate that they had little or no responsibility for student employment or that their institution did not have a student employment program. Similarly, respondents from vocational/technical schools, nursing schools, and graduate/professional schools were more likely than other groups to indicate that they had little or no responsibility for student employment or that their institution did not have a student employment program (Table 10-2).

Table 10-3 permits the identification of several differences in responsibility for student employment based on institutional size. For example, respondents from institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more students were approximately twice as likely to indicate that their office had little or no responsibility for student employment as were respondents from smaller institutions. Although 11.9 percent of the respondents from institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 students indicated their institution did not have a student employment program, this was the most unlikely response from individuals in all of the other size categories.

Table 10-1 Office Responsibility for Student Employment by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

	FINDS PLACE CWS	FIND POS.FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU.EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	236	18	18	196	31	5	16	520
	45.385	3.462	3.462	37.692	5.962	0.962	3.077	100.000
	47.581	56.250	40.000	41.525	22.794	7.937	17.582	38.951
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	235	14	24	268	74	23	54	692
	33.960	2.023	3.468	38.728	10.694	3.324	7.803	100.000
	47.379	43.750	53.333	56.780	54.412	36.508	59.341	51.835
PROPRI-ETARY	25		3	8	31	35	21	123
	20.325		2.439	6.504	25.203	28.455	17.073	100.000
	5.040		6.667	1.695	22.794	55.556	23.077	9.213
COLUMN SUMS	496	32	45	472	136	63	91	1335
	37.154	2.397	3.371	35.356	10.187	4.719	6.816	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 10-2 Office Responsibility for Student Employment by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE: COLUMNS = OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

	FINDS PLACE CWS	FIND POS.FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU.EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	38		3	17	21	28	13	120
	31.667		2.500	14.167	17.500	23.333	10.833	100.000
	7.819		7.317	3.680	15.789	46.667	15.294	9.238
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	131	4	10	67	24	9	14	259
	50.579	1.544	3.861	25.869	9.266	3.475	5.405	100.000
	26.955	12.500	24.390	14.502	18.045	15.000	16.471	19.938
4 YEAR	135	7	8	171	22	2	26	371
	36.388	1.887	2.156	46.092	5.930	0.539	7.008	100.000
	27.778	21.875	19.512	37.013	16.541	3.333	30.588	28.560
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	154	19	12	195	44	1	22	447
	34.452	4.251	2.685	43.624	9.843	0.224	4.922	100.000
	31.687	59.375	29.268	42.208	33.083	1.667	25.882	34.411
NURSING	8		1		4	10		23
	34.783		4.348		17.391	43.478		100.000
	1.646		2.439		3.008	16.667		1.771
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	20	2	7	12	18	10	10	79
	25.316	2.532	8.861	15.190	22.785	12.658	12.658	100.000
	4.115	6.250	17.073	2.597	13.534	16.667	11.765	6.082
COLUMN SUMS	486	32	41	462	133	60	85	1299
	37.413	2.463	3.156	35.566	10.239	4.619	6.543	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 10-3 Office Responsibility for Student Employment by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

	FINDS PLACE CWS	FIND POS.FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU.EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	168	7	16	139	50	57	40	477
	35.220	1.468	3.354	29.140	10.482	11.950	8.386	100.000
	33.871	21.875	35.556	29.449	36.496	90.476	43.956	35.704
1000-3999	154	8	16	165	36	5	31	415
	37.108	1.928	3.855	39.759	8.675	1.205	7.470	100.000
	31.048	25.000	35.556	34.958	26.277	7.937	34.066	31.063
4000-9999	92	5	9	94	16		9	225
	40.889	2.222	4.000	41.778	7.111		4.000	100.000
	18.548	15.625	20.000	19.915	11.679		9.890	16.841
10,000-19,999	48	8	3	51	23	1	8	142
	33.803	5.634	2.113	35.915	16.197	0.704	5.634	100.000
	9.677	25.000	6.667	10.805	16.788	1.587	8.791	10.629
20,000+	34	4	1	23	12		3	77
	44.156	5.195	1.299	29.870	15.584		3.896	100.000
	6.855	12.500	2.222	4.873	8.759		3.297	5.763
COLUMN SUMS	496	32	45	472	137	63	91	1336
	37.126	2.395	3.368	35.329	10.254	4.716	6.811	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 11-1 Through 11-3 "What Percentage of the Funds Administered by Your Office are Assigned on the Basis of Computed Financial Need?"

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents stated that all of the funds administered by their office were assigned based on financial need. Respondents from proprietary institutions were most likely to report that all of their funds were based on financial need. In the aggregate, over 81 percent of the respondents stated that 80 percent or more of their funds were assigned based on financial need (Table 11-1).

Respondents from vocational/technical schools, nursing schools, and graduate/professional schools reported the highest percentages of funds which were assigned totally based on financial need (Table 11-2).

As shown in Table 11-3, there were differences in the percentage of funds assigned on the basis of financial need based upon institutional size.

Table 11-1 Percentage of Funds Based on Need by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = % FUNDS ADMINISTERED ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED

	100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	89	245	95	37	27	38	531
	16.761	46.139	17.891	6.968	5.085	7.156	100.000
	26.727	41.952	46.569	35.238	42.857	48.101	38.816
INDEP. (PRI-VATE)	162	313	100	65	32	36	708
	22.881	44.209	14.124	9.181	4.520	5.085	100.000
	48.649	53.596	49.020	61.905	50.794	45.570	51.754
PROPRI-ETARY	82	26	9	3	4	5	129
	63.566	20.155	6.977	2.326	3.101	3.876	100.000
	24.625	4.452	4.412	2.857	6.349	6.329	9.430
COLUMN SUMS	333	584	204	105	63	79	1368
	24.342	42.690	14.912	7.675	4.605	5.775	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 11-2 Percentage of Funds Based on Need by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:

COLUMNS = % FUNDS ADMINISTERED ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED

	100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	67	37	11	1	3	8	127
	52.756	29.134	8.661	0.787	2.362	6.299	100.000
	20.872	6.514	5.446	0.971	4.839	10.390	9.527
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	76	123	35	14	4	10	262
	29.008	46.947	13.359	5.344	1.527	3.817	100.000
	23.676	21.655	17.327	13.592	6.452	12.987	19.655
4 YEAR	59	180	69	36	22	15	381
	15.486	47.244	18.110	9.449	5.774	3.937	100.000
	18.380	31.690	34.158	34.951	35.484	19.481	28.582
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	63	199	81	47	30	38	458
	13.755	43.450	17.686	10.262	6.550	8.297	100.000
	19.626	35.035	40.099	45.631	48.387	49.351	34.359
NURSING	13	9	1		1		24
	54.167	37.500	4.167		4.167		100.000
	4.050	1.585	0.495		1.613		1.800
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	43	20	5	5	2	6	81
	53.086	24.691	6.173	6.173	2.469	7.407	100.000
	13.396	3.521	2.475	4.854	3.226	7.792	6.077
COLUMN SUMS	321	568	202	103	62	77	1333
	24.081	42.611	15.154	7.727	4.651	5.776	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 11-3 Percentage of Funds Based on Need by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = % FUNDS ADMINISTERED ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED

	100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	185	177	56	34	17	26	495
	37.374	35.758	11.313	6.869	3.434	5.253	100.000
	55.556	30.308	27.317	32.075	26.984	32.911	36.131
1000-3999	91	194	67	34	19	19	424
	21.462	45.755	15.802	8.019	4.481	4.481	100.000
	27.327	33.219	32.683	32.075	30.159	24.051	30.949
4000-9999	22	107	42	19	14	21	225
	9.778	47.556	18.667	8.444	6.222	9.333	100.000
	6.607	18.322	20.488	17.925	22.222	26.582	16.423
10,000-19,999	21	73	21	13	10	10	148
	14.189	49.324	14.189	8.784	6.757	6.757	100.000
	6.306	12.500	10.244	12.264	15.873	12.658	10.803
20,000+	14	33	19	6	3	3	78
	17.949	42.308	24.359	7.692	3.846	3.846	100.000
	4.204	5.651	9.268	5.660	4.762	3.797	5.693
COLUMN SUMS	333	584	205	106	63	79	1370
	24.307	42.628	14.964	7.737	4.599	5.766	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section E

External Contacts

TABLE 12-1 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Written or Called the Office of U. S. Senator or U. S. Representative Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Slightly over half of the respondents indicated that they had not contacted the office of a member of the U. S. Congress regarding a financial problem or issue during the last year. The most politically active group (6.5% of the respondents) had contacted the office of a member of Congress six or more times during the prior twelve-month period.

Table 12-1 Contacts With the Office of a Member of Congress by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED U.S. SENATOR/CONGR. ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	593	374	213	96	1276
TOR	46.473	29.310	16.693	7.524	100.000
	67.234	80.603	82.558	86.486	74.402
ASSOC./	110	22	15	5	152
ASSIS.	72.368	14.474	9.868	3.289	100.000
DIRECT.	12.472	4.741	5.814	4.505	8.863
FIN.AID	95	38	17	4	154
OFFICER	61.688	24.675	11.039	2.597	100.000
COUN/AD	10.771	8.190	6.589	3.604	8.980
OTHER	84	30	13	6	133
	63.158	22.556	9.774	4.511	100.000
	9.524	6.466	5.039	5.405	7.755
COLUMN	882	464	258	111	1715
SUMS	51.429	27.055	15.044	6.472	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-2 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Written or Called a Federal Official (DHEW/USOE) in Washington Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Approximately 75 percent of the respondents stated that they had contacted a Federal official in Washington regarding a financial aid matter in the prior 12-month period. The largest category of respondents (32.3%) had contacted a Federal official in Washington either 1 or 2 times within the past year.

Table 12-2 Contacts with a Federal Official in Washington by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED WASHINGTON FED.OFF. ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	300	421	374	113	103	1311
TOR	22.883	32.113	28.528	8.619	7.857	100.000
	66.225	73.473	80.258	77.931	76.296	73.984
ASSOC./	47	51	32	16	12	158
ASSIS.	29.747	32.278	20.253	10.127	7.595	100.000
DIRECT.	10.375	8.901	6.867	11.034	8.889	8.916
FIN.AID	53	58	38	8	8	165
OFFICER	32.121	35.152	23.030	4.848	4.848	100.000
COUN/AD	11.700	10.122	8.155	5.517	5.926	9.312
OTHER	53	43	22	8	12	138
	38.406	31.159	15.942	5.797	8.696	100.000
	11.700	7.504	4.721	5.517	8.889	7.788
COLUMN	453	573	466	145	135	1772
SUMS	25.564	32.336	26.298	8.183	7.619	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-3 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a Federal Official in a USOE Regional Office Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Over 88 percent of the respondents had contacted the regional Office of Education at least once in the prior twelve-month period. Approximately 37 percent of the respondents reported six or more contacts with the regional office within the prior year.

Table 12-3 Contacts with a USOE Regional Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED REGIONAL FED. OFF. ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	121	254	439	264	278	1356
	8.923	18.732	32.375	19.469	20.501	100.000
	55.505	72.159	75.820	78.571	79.429	73.896
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	22	33	45	29	30	159
	13.836	20.755	28.302	18.239	18.868	100.000
	10.092	9.375	7.772	8.631	8.571	8.665
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	32	32	64	24	24	176
	18.182	18.182	36.364	13.636	13.636	100.000
	14.679	9.091	11.054	7.143	6.857	9.591
OTHER	43	33	31	19	18	144
	29.861	22.917	21.528	13.194	12.500	100.000
	19.725	9.375	5.354	5.655	5.143	7.847
COLUMN SUMS	218	352	579	336	350	1835
	11.880	19.183	31.553	18.311	19.074	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-4 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted the NASFAA Office in Washington Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents had written or called the NASFAA office within the prior year.

Table 12-4 Contacts with the NASFAA Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED NASFAA CENT. OFFICE ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	928	198	86	48	1260
TOR	73.651	15.714	6.825	3.810	100.000
	71.994	80.488	83.495	84.211	74.336
ASSOC./	116	22	7	5	150
ASSIS.	77.333	14.667	4.667	3.333	100.000
DIRECT.	8.999	8.943	6.796	8.772	8.850
FIN.AID	134	16	3	1	154
OFFICER	87.013	10.390	1.948	0.649	100.000
COUN/AD	10.396	6.504	2.913	1.754	9.086
OTHER	111	10	7	3	131
	84.733	7.634	5.344	2.290	100.000
	8.611	4.065	6.796	5.263	7.729
COLUMN	1289	246	103	57	1695
SUMS	76.047	14.513	6.077	3.363	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-5 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a State Senator/State Representative Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Slightly over 60 percent of the respondents had not contacted a State Senator or Representative regarding a financial aid matter within the past year. Only 16.7 percent of the respondents had contacted a member of the State Legislature with a financial aid problem or issue three or more times within the previous twelve-month period.

Table 12-5 Contacts with a Member of a State Legislature by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED STATE SEN./CONGR. ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	710	301	151	81	1243
	57.120	24.216	12.148	6.516	100.000
	69.608	79.420	78.646	91.011	73.988
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	110	25	13	4	152
	72.368	16.447	8.553	2.632	100.000
	10.784	6.596	6.771	4.494	9.048
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	104	35	14		153
	67.974	22.876	9.150		100.000
	10.196	9.235	7.292		9.107
OTHER	96	18	14	4	132
	72.727	13.636	10.606	3.030	100.000
	9.412	4.749	7.292	4.494	7.857
COLUMN SUMS	1020	379	192	89	1680
	60.714	22.560	11.429	5.298	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-6 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a State Agency Official Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Over 80 percent of the respondents had contacted a State agency official on a financial aid matter within the prior twelve-month period. The most prevalent response was in the "10 and over" category with one-third of the respondents falling into this group.

Table 12-6 Contacts with a State Agency Official by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED ST. AGENCY OFFICIAL ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	234	174	256	181	465	1310
TOR	17.863	13.282	19.542	13.817	35.496	100.000
	65.915	71.901	75.516	73.577	77.500	73.513
ASSOC./	32	20	26	20	59	157
ASSIS.	20.382	12.739	16.561	12.739	37.580	100.000
DIRECT.	9.014	8.264	7.670	8.130	9.833	8.810
FIN.AID	49	30	22	29	41	171
OFFICER	28.655	17.544	12.865	16.959	23.977	100.000
COUN/AD	13.803	12.397	6.490	11.789	6.833	9.596
OTHER	40	18	35	16	35	144
	27.778	12.500	24.306	11.111	24.306	100.000
	11.268	7.438	10.324	6.504	5.833	8.081
COLUMN SUMS	355	242	339	246	600	1782
	19.921	13.580	19.024	13.805	33.670	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section F

Professional Development

TABLES 13-1 Through 13-5 "If you Were Able to Attend Only one Major Conference per Year, Which one Would you Prefer?"

If respondents were constrained to only attending one major conference per year, approximately equal numbers of them would attend either their Regional Student Financial Aid Conference (39.0%) or their State Financial Aid Conference (42.3%). 12.4 percent of the respondents stated that they would attend the NASFAA Annual Conference, with Associate/Assistant Directors being the most likely to choose the NASFAA Annual Conference (Table 13-1).

Directors' responses to the above question vary by years of experience (significant at the .05 level). For example, 8.6 percent of the Directors with one year or less of experience expressed a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference as opposed to 19.6 percent of those with 16 or more years of experience (Table 13-2).

Directors from public institutions were almost twice as likely (significant at the .01 level) to express a preference for attending the NASFAA National Conference as were Directors from independent institutions (Table 13-3). Since institutional control is closely related to size, it is not surprising to find substantial differences (significant at the .01 level) in the percentage of respondents expressing a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference based upon institutional size. For example, less than 7 percent of the Directors in the under 1,000 category expressed a preference for the NASFAA Conference, while over 17 percent of the Directors from institutions in the two categories over 10,000 students expressed a preference for the NASFAA Conference (Table 13-4).

As shown in Table 13-5, Directors from universities and graduate/professional schools were the most likely to express a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference.

Table 13-1 Which Conference Preferred by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	152	540	609	75	1376
	11.047	39.244	44.259	5.451	100.000
	65.801	74.380	77.382	64.655	73.978
ASSOC./ASSIS.	35	74	51	5	165
	21.212	44.848	30.909	3.030	100.000
DIRECT.	15.152	10.193	6.480	4.310	8.871
FIN.AID OFFICER	27	66	72	10	182
	14.835	36.264	43.407	5.495	100.000
COUN/AD	11.688	9.091	10.038	8.621	9.785
OTHER	17	46	49	26	137
	12.409	33.577	35.036	18.978	100.000
	7.359	6.336	6.223	22.414	7.366
COLUMN SUMS	231	726	787	116	1860
	12.419	39.032	42.312	6.237	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-2 Which Conference Preferred by Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	15 8.571 9.868	79 45.143 14.657	71 40.571 11.658	10 5.714 13.333	175 100.000 12.727
2-3 YEARS	25 10.823 16.447	92 39.827 17.069	103 44.589 16.913	11 4.762 14.667	231 100.000 16.800
4-5 YEARS	26 9.489 17.105	98 35.766 18.182	138 50.365 22.660	12 4.380 16.000	274 100.000 19.927
6-10 YEARS	56 12.500 36.842	161 35.938 29.870	202 45.089 33.169	29 6.473 38.667	448 100.000 32.582
11-15 YEARS	20 10.204 13.158	86 43.878 15.955	83 42.347 13.629	7 3.571 9.333	196 100.000 14.255
16+ YEARS	10 19.608 6.579	23 45.098 4.267	12 23.529 1.970	6 11.765 8.000	51 100.000 3.709
COLUMN SUMS	152 11.055 100.000	539 39.200 100.000	609 44.291 100.000	75 5.455 100.000	1375 100.000 100.000

Table 13-3 Which Conference Preferred by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	81 15.197 53.642	198 37.148 36.667	233 43.715 38.512	21 3.940 28.378	533 100.000 38.905
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	58 8.192 38.411	280 39.548 51.852	326 46.045 53.884	44 6.215 59.459	708 100.000 51.679
PROPRIETARY	12 9.302 7.947	62 48.062 11.481	46 35.659 7.603	9 6.977 12.162	129 100.000 9.416
COLUMN SUMS	151 11.022 100.000	540 39.416 100.000	605 44.161 100.000	74 5.401 100.000	1370 100.000 100.000

Table 13-4 Which Conference Preferred by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASPAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	34	201	241	19	495
	6.869	40.606	48.687	3.838	100.000
	22.973	37.222	39.638	25.333	36.105
1000-3999	42	157	198	27	424
	9.906	37.028	46.698	6.368	100.000
	28.378	29.074	32.566	36.000	30.926
4000-9999	31	93	86	16	226
	13.717	41.150	38.053	7.080	100.000
	20.946	17.222	14.145	21.333	16.484
10,000-19,999	27	56	58	5	146
	18.493	38.356	39.726	3.425	100 000
	18.243	10.370	9.539	6.667	10.649
20,000+	14	33	25	8	80
	17.500	41.250	31.250	10.000	100.000
	9.459	6.111	4.112	10.667	5.835
COLUMN SUMS	148	540	608	75	1371
	10.795	39.387	44.347	5.470	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-5 Which Conference Preferred by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASPAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	8	55	57	8	128
	6.250	42.969	44.531	6.250	100.000
	5.556	10.476	9.596	11.111	9.588
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	26	110	122	5	263
	9.886	41.825	46.388	1.901	100.000
	18.056	20.952	20.539	6.944	19.700
4 YEAR	27	148	188	19	382
	7.068	38.743	49.215	4.974	100.000
	18.750	28.190	31.650	26.389	28.614
5 YEAR AND BEYOND	72	174	183	28	457
	15.755	38.074	40.044	6.127	100.000
	50.000	33.143	30.808	38.889	34.232
NURSING		12	12	1	25
		48.000	48.000	4.000	100.000
		2.286	2.020	1.389	1.873
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	11	26	32	11	80
	13.750	32.500	40.000	13.750	100.000
	7.639	4.952	5.387	15.278	5.993
COLUMN SUMS	144	525	594	72	1335
	10.787	39.326	44.494	5.393	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-6 Through 13-9 "Does Your Institution Pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Within Your State?"

Over 95 percent of the respondents reported that their institutions were willing to pay expenses associated with attending an instate financial aid meeting (Table 13-6).

Directors' responses to the above question show no significant variance by institutional control or institutional size. The most sizable variance in responses (significant at the .01 level) is based on "kinds of students served" and whether or not the respondent's office is the central financial aid office. Directors employed in offices serving only graduate/professional students were the least likely to have their expenses covered for attendance at instate meetings (however, 81.1 percent do have their expenses covered). Directors employed in non-central financial aid offices were less likely to have their expenses covered than those employed in the central financial aid offices (79.4% vs. 97.4%).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in whether an institution would provide paid release time based on the percentage of annual employment time spent in financial aid. As employment time decreased, so too did institutional willingness to cover expenses associated with instate meetings. However, among Directors employed less than one-half time in the financial aid office, institutions were still willing to cover expenses for 88.4 percent of the respondents (Table 13-9).

Table 13-6 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1351	89	1900
TOR	96.503	3.500	100.000
	74.517	55.056	73.607
ASSOC./	162	5	167
ASSIS.	97.006	2.994	100.000
DIRECT.	8.935	5.618	8.780
FIN.AID	175	13	188
OFFICER	93.085	6.915	100.000
COUN/AD	9.653	14.607	9.884
OTHER	125	22	147
	85.034	14.966	100.000
	6.895	24.719	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1813	89	1902
	95.321	4.679	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-7 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	77	18	95
	81.053	18.947	100.000
	5.725	36.735	6.815
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	764	18	782
	97.698	2.302	100.000
	56.803	36.735	56.098
UNDGR& GR/PROF	504	13	517
	97.485	2.515	100.000
	37.472	26.531	37.088
COLUMN SUMS	1345	49	1394
	96.485	3.515	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-8 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Central Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1297	35	1332
	97.372	2.628	100.000
	96.288	72.917	95.484
NO	50	13	63
	79.365	20.635	100.000
	3.712	27.083	4.516
COL SUMS	1347	48	1395
	96.559	3.441	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-9 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Percentage of Employment Time (Directors)

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	776	18	794
	97.733	2.267	100.000
	57.439	36.735	56.714
75-99%	278	8	286
	97.203	2.797	100.000
	20.577	16.327	20.429
50-74%	144	3	147
	97.959	2.041	100.000
	10.659	6.122	10.500
LESS THAN HALF	153	20	173
	88.439	11.561	100.000
	11.325	40.816	12.357
COLUMN SUMS	1351	49	1400
	96.500	3.500	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-10 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Within Your State?"

As shown in Table 13-10, responses to whether an institution will provide paid release time for attendance at an instate meeting closely approximate responses to the previous question (will your institution pay your expenses for attendance at instate financial aid meetings).

Table 13-10 Paid Release Time for Instate Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: RELEASED TIME?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1389	51	1400
TOR	96.357	3.643	100.000
	74.202	60.714	73.607
ASSOC.	161	6	167
ASSIS.	96.407	3.593	100.000
DIRECT.	8.656	7.143	8.780
FIN.AID	176	12	188
OFFICER	93.617	6.383	100.000
COUN/AD	9.681	14.286	9.884
OTHER	132	15	147
	89.796	10.204	100.000
	7.261	17.857	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1818	84	1902
	95.584	4.416	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-11 Through 13-15 "Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Out-of-State Financial Aid Meetings?"

Approximately 83 percent of the respondents reported that their institution would pay their expenses for out-of-state financial aid meetings (Table 13-11).

Similar relationships (significant at the .01 level) were discovered in responses to this question as in the responses to the question relating to instate meetings. There was a discernible tendency for institutions to be more parsimonious with covering the expenses of Directors employed in offices serving graduate/professional students (Table 13-12), and with Directors employed in non-central financial aid offices (Table 13-13). In addition, percentage of employment time spent in the financial aid office also had the previously observed effect (Table 13-14).

There were no significant differences in Directors' responses based upon institutional size. It is interesting to note, however, that institutions with enrollments of 20,000 or more were perceived by Directors as being slightly less likely to cover out-of-state meeting expenses than institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (Table 13-15).

Table 13-11 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	1186	214	1400
	84.714	15.286	100.000
	75.111	66.254	73.607
ASSOC./ASSIS. DIRECT.	143	24	167
	85.629	14.371	100.000
	9.056	7.430	8.780
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	147	41	188
	78.191	21.809	100.000
	9.310	12.693	9.884
OTHER	103	44	147
	70.068	29.932	100.000
	6.523	13.622	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1579	323	1902
	83.018	16.982	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-12 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	66 69.474 5.588	29 30.526 13.615	95 100.000 6.815
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	663 84.783 56.139	119 15.217 55.869	782 100.000 56.098
UNDGRD & GR/PROF	452 87.427 38.273	65 12.573 30.516	517 100.000 37.088
COLUMN SUMS	1181 84.720 100.000	213 15.280 100.000	1394 100.000 100.000

Table 13-13 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Central Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1137 85.360 96.193	195 14.640 91.549	1332 100.000 95.484
NO	45 71.429 3.807	18 28.571 8.451	63 100.000 4.516
COL SUMS	1182 84.731 100.000	213 15.269 100.000	1395 100.000 100.000

Table 13-14 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Percentage of Employment Time in Financial Aid (Directors)

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	691	103	794
	87.028	12.972	100.000
	58.263	48.131	56.714
75-99%	244	42	286
	85.315	14.685	100.000
	20.573	19.626	20.429
50-74%	124	23	147
	84.354	15.646	100.000
	10.455	10.748	10.500
LESS THAN HALF	127	46	173
	73.410	26.590	100.000
	10.708	21.495	12.357
COLUMN SUMS	1186	214	1400
	84.714	15.286	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-15 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	415	92	507
	81.854	18.146	100.000
	35.199	42.991	36.396
1000-3999	366	64	430
	85.116	14.884	100.000
	31.043	29.907	30.869
4000-9999	199	27	226
	88.053	11.947	100.000
	16.879	12.617	16.224
10,000-19,999	133	16	149
	89.262	10.738	100.000
	11.281	7.477	10.696
20,000+	66	15	81
	81.481	18.519	100.000
	5.598	7.009	5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1179	214	1393
	84.637	15.363	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-16 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Outside of Your State?"

As shown in Table 13-16, institutions were slightly more likely to provide paid release time to attend out-of-state meetings (85.8%) than they were to cover expenses for such meetings (see Table 13-11). In general, similar differences to those already noted are apparent by "kinds of students served," whether or not the respondent is from the "central" financial aid office, and by percentage of employment time spent in financial aid.

Table 13-16 Paid Release Time for Out-of-State Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING OUTSTATE RELEASED TIME?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1218	182	1400
TOR	87.000	13.000	100.000
	74.674	67.159	73.607
ASSOC./	167	20	187
ASSTS.	89.037	11.976	100.000
DIRECT.	9.013	7.380	9.780
FIN.AID	153	35	188
OFFICER	81.383	18.617	100.000
COUN/AD	9.381	12.915	9.884
OTHER	113	38	187
	76.871	23.129	100.000
	6.928	12.546	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	631	271	1902
	85.752	14.248	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-17 Through 13-19 "Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Workshops?"

Almost 93 percent of the respondents stated that their institution would pay their expenses for attendance at a financial aid workshop (Table 13-17).

As in a number of the previous questions, Directors were less likely (significant at the .01 level) to have their expenses covered if they worked in an office which only served graduate/professional students (Table 13-18), or in a non-central financial aid office (Table 13-19).

There were few differences to responses to the above question among Directors based upon institutional type and control.

Table 13-17 Expenses Paid for Workshops by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR WORKSHOPS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1308	92	1400
TOR	93.429	6.571	100.000
	74.192	66.187	73.607
ASSOC./	153	14	167
ASSTS.	91.617	8.383	100.000
DIRECT.	8.678	10.072	8.780
FIN.AID	175	13	188
OFFICER	93.085	6.915	100.000
COUN/AD	9.926	9.353	9.884
OTHER	127	20	147
	86.395	13.605	100.000
	7.204	14.388	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1763	139	1902
	92.692	7.308	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-18 Expenses Paid for Workshops by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR WORKSHOPS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	78 82.105 5.986	17 17.895 18.681	95 100.000 6.815
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	736 94.118 56.485	46 5.882 50.549	782 100.000 56.098
UNDGRS GR/PROF	483 93.588 37.529	28 5.416 30.769	517 100.000 37.088
COLUMN SUMS	1303 93.472 100.000	91 6.528 100.000	1394 100.000 100.000

Table 13-19 Expenses Paid for Workshops by Central Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR WORKSHOPS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1255 94.219 96.169	77 5.781 85.556	1332 100.000 95.484
NO	50 79.365 3.831	13 20.635 14.444	63 100.000 4.516
COL SUMS	1305 93.548 100.000	90 6.452 100.000	1395 100.000 100.000

TABLE 13-20 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Workshops?"

Almost 95 percent of the respondents stated that their institution would provide them with paid release time for attendance at a financial aid workshop (Table 13-20).

There were no significant differences in responses to the above question among Directors of Financial Aid based upon institutional type, control, size, or whether the respondent worked in the central or a non-central aid office. As in a number of previous questions, however, respondents employed in offices serving graduate/professional students were less likely to receive paid release time than were other respondents.

Table 13-20 Paid Release Time for Workshops by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR WORKSHOPS: RELEASED TIME?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1333	67	1400
TOR	95.214	4.786	100.000
	71.932	67.677	73.607
ASSOC./	157	10	167
ASSIS.	94.012	5.988	100.000
DIRECT.	8.708	10.101	8.780
FIN.AID	177	11	188
OFFICER	94.149	5.851	100.000
COUN/AD	9.817	11.111	9.884
OTHER	136	11	147
	92.517	7.483	100.000
	7.543	11.111	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1803	99	1902
	94.795	5.205	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-21 Through 13-25 'Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Course Work Related to Your Job?"

Less than 40 percent of the respondents stated that their institutions would pay for job-related courses (Table 13-21).

In contrast with previous questions, Directors employed in offices serving graduate/professional students and in non-central financial aid offices indicated a greater institutional willingness to pay for job-related courses than did other respondents (see Tables 13-22 and 13-23).

As shown in Table 13-24, 61.9 percent of the Directors at proprietary institutions indicated that their institutions would pay for course expenses, while respondents from both public and independent institutions reported less institutional willingness to pay for courses (significant at the .01 level).

Table 13-25 indicates the differences in willingness to pay for job-related courses based upon institutional type.

Table 13-21 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	559	841	1400
TOR	39.929	60.071	100.000
	74.434	73.067	73.607
ASSOC./	66	101	167
ASSIS.	39.521	60.479	100.000
DIRECT.	8.788	8.775	8.780
FIN.AID	76	112	188
OFFICER	40.426	59.574	100.000
COORD/AD	10.120	9.731	9.884
OTHER	50	97	147
	34.014	65.986	100.000
	6.658	8.427	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	751	1151	1902
	39.485	60.515	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-22 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

ROWS = KINDS OF STUDENTS SERVED

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF ONLY	41 43.158 7.401	54 56.842 6.429	95 100.000 6.815
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	305 39.003 55.054	477 60.997 56.786	782 100.000 56.098
UNDGRS GR/PROF	208 40.232 37.545	309 59.768 36.786	517 100.000 37.088
COLUMN SUMS	554 39.742 100.000	840 60.258 100.000	1394 100.000 100.000

Table 13-23 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Central Financial Aid (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	524 39.339 94.245	808 60.661 96.305	1332 100.000 95.484
NO	32 50.794 5.755	31 49.206 3.695	63 100.000 4.516
COL SUMS	556 39.857 100.000	839 60.143 100.000	1395 100.000 100.000

Table 13-24 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	182	354	536
	33.955	66.045	100.000
	32.793	42.193	38.451
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	290	434	724
	40.055	59.945	100.000
	52.252	51.728	51.937
PROPRIETARY	83	51	134
	61.940	38.060	100.000
	14.955	6.079	9.613
COLUMN SUMS	555	839	1394
	39.813	60.187	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-25 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	71	60	131
	54.198	45.802	100.000
	13.246	7.317	9.661
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	85	181	266
	31.955	68.045	100.000
	15.858	22.073	19.617
4 YEAR	108	236	384
	38.542	61.458	100.000
	27.612	28.780	28.319
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	174	289	463
	37.581	62.419	100.000
	32.463	35.240	34.145
NURSING	18	7	25
	72.000	28.000	100.000
	3.358	0.854	1.844
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	40	47	87
	45.977	54.023	100.000
	7.463	5.732	6.416
COLUMN SUMS	536	820	1356
	39.528	60.472	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-26 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Course Work Related to Your Job?"

Institutions are more willing to provide paid release time for job-related course work (51.4%) than they are to cover course expenses (39.5%). In general, Directors' responses to the above question tended to vary by institutional type, etc., in the same manner as in Tables 13-21 through 13-25.

Table 13-26 Paid Release Time for Course Work by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: RELEASED TIME?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-TOR	722 51.571 73.824	678 48.429 73.377	1400 100.000 73.607
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	95 56.886 9.714	72 43.114 7.792	167 100.000 8.780
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	92 48.936 9.407	96 51.064 10.390	188 100.000 9.884
OTHER	69 46.939 7.055	78 53.061 8.442	147 100.000 7.729
COLUMN SUMS	978 51.420 100.000	924 48.580 100.000	1902 100.000 100.000

TABLES 13-27 and 13-28 "Does Your Institution pay for Office Subscriptions?"

Almost 80 percent of the respondents indicated that their institution would pay for office subscriptions (Table 13-27).

There were some differences among Directors' responses (Table 13-28), with Directors from Nursing Schools and two-year colleges indicating the highest levels of institutional unwillingness to pay for office subscriptions.

Table 13-27 Institution Pay for Office Subscriptions by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR OFFICE SUBSCRIPTIONS PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1164	232	1900
TOR	83.429	16.571	100.000
	76.393	60.574	71.607
ASSOC./	116	51	16
ASSIS.	69.461	30.539	100.000
DIRECT.	7.637	13.316	8.780
FIN.AID	131	57	188
OFFICER	69.681	30.319	100.000
COUN/AD	8.624	14.883	9.888
OTHER	104	43	147
	70.748	29.252	100.000
	6.847	11.227	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1519	383	1902
	79.863	20.137	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-28 Institution Pay for Office Subscriptions by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR OFFICE SUBSCRIPTIONS PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC.	110	21	131
TECH.	83.969	16.031	100.000
	9.683	9.545	9.661
2 YEARS	203	63	266
& UNDER	76.316	23.684	100.000
NOT V.T	17.870	28.636	19.617
4 YEAR	330	54	384
	85.938	14.063	100.000
	29.049	24.545	28.319
4 YEAR	403	60	463
AND	87.041	12.959	100.000
BEYOND	35.475	27.273	34.145
NURSING	19	6	25
	76.000	24.000	100.000
	1.673	2.727	1.844
GRAD/	71	16	87
PROFES.	81.609	18.391	100.000
ONLY	6.250	7.273	6.416
COLUMN SUMS	1136	220	1356
	83.776	16.224	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-29 Through 13-40 "Does Your Institution Pay for Individual Memberships in State/Regional/National Associations?"

Respondents reported that their institutions were slightly more willing to pay for individual state association memberships than either individual, regional, or national association memberships. As shown in Tables 13-29, 13-30, and 13-31, institutions were more likely to pay for Directors' individual memberships than for respondents in other job categories (significant at the .01 level).

Directors from proprietary institutions were most likely to report that their institutions would pay for individual memberships in either state, regional, or national associations (Tables 13-32, 13-33, 13-34). At the other extreme, Directors from public institutions reported that their institutions were much less likely to pay for such memberships (significant at the .01 level).

As institutional size increased, there was a strong tendency (significant at the .01 level) for institutions to be less likely to pay for individual memberships for Directors (Tables 13-35, 13-36, 13-37).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in institutional willingness to pay for Directors' individual memberships. Directors from graduate/professional institutions reported the least institutional willingness to pay for individual memberships, while respondents from vocational/technical schools were at the other end of the continuum (Tables 13-38, 13-39, 13-40).

Table 13-29 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1098	306	1800
TOR	78.143	21.857	100.000
	77.429	62.577	73.607
ASSOC./	110	57	167
ASSIS.	65.869	34.132	100.000
DIRECT.	7.785	11.656	8.780
FIN.AID	127	61	188
OFFICER	67.553	32.447	100.000
COUN/AD	8.989	12.474	9.884
OTHER	82	65	147
	55.782	44.218	100.000
	5.803	13.292	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1413	489	1902
	74.290	25.710	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-30 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1059	342	1400
TOR	75.571	24.429	100.000
	78.603	61.511	73.607
ASSOC./	92	75	167
ASSIS.	55.090	44.910	100.000
DIRECT.	6.835	13.489	8.780
FIN.AID	117	71	188
OFFICER	62.234	37.766	100.000
COMM/AD	8.692	12.770	9.884
OTHER	79	68	147
	53.741	46.259	100.000
	5.869	12.230	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1346	556	1902
	70.768	29.232	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-31 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. NAT. ASS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIREC-	1020	380	1400
TOR	72.857	27.143	100.000
	78.768	62.603	73.607
ASSOC./	83	78	167
ASSIS.	53.293	46.707	100.000
DIRECT.	6.873	12.850	8.780
FIN.AID	110	78	188
OFFICER	58.511	41.489	100.000
COMM/AD	8.494	12.850	9.884
OTHER	76	71	147
	51.701	48.299	100.000
	5.863	11.697	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1295	607	1902
	68.086	31.914	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-32 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	343	193	536
	63.993	36.007	100.000
	31.468	63.487	38.451
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	624	100	724
	86.188	13.812	100.000
	57.249	32.895	51.937
PROPRIETARY	123	11	134
	91.791	8.209	100.000
	11.284	3.618	9.613
COLUMN SUMS	1090	304	1394
	78.192	21.808	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-33 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	337	199	536
	62.873	37.127	100.000
	31.973	58.529	38.451
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	601	123	724
	83.011	16.989	100.000
	57.021	36.176	51.937
PROPRIETARY	116	18	134
	86.567	13.433	100.000
	11.006	5.294	9.613
COLUMN SUMS	1054	340	1394
	75.610	24.390	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-34 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. NAT. ASS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	327	209	536
	61.007	38.993	100.000
	32.153	55.438	38.451
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	581	143	724
	80.249	19.751	100.000
	57.129	37.931	51.937
PROPRIETARY	109	25	134
	81.343	18.657	100.000
	10.718	6.631	9.613
COLUMN SUMS	1017	377	1394
	72.956	27.044	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-35 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	432	75	507
	85.207	14.793	100.000
	39.706	24.590	36.396
1000-3999	348	82	430
	80.930	19.070	100.000
	31.985	26.885	30.869
4000-9999	163	63	226
	72.124	27.876	100.000
	14.982	20.656	16.224
10,000-19,999	103	46	149
	69.128	30.872	100.000
	9.467	15.082	10.696
20,000+	42	39	81
	51.852	48.148	100.000
	3.860	12.787	5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1088	305	1393
	78.105	21.895	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-36 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	409	98	507
	80.671	19.329	100.000
	38.878	28.739	36.396
1000-3999	336	94	430
	78.140	21.860	100.000
	31.939	27.566	30.869
4000-9999	166	60	226
	73.451	26.549	100.000
	15.779	17.595	16.224
10,000-19,999	101	48	149
	67.785	32.215	100.000
	9.601	14.076	10.696
20,000+	40	41	81
	49.383	50.617	100.000
	3.802	12.023	5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1052	341	1393
	75.520	24.480	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-37 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. NAT. ASS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	405	102	507
	79.882	20.118	100.000
	39.941	26.913	36.396
1000-3999	313	117	430
	72.791	27.209	100.000
	30.868	30.871	30.869
4000-9999	160	66	226
	70.796	29.204	100.000
	15.779	17.414	16.224
10,000-19,999	92	57	149
	61.745	38.255	100.000
	9.073	15.040	10.696
20,000+	44	37	81
	54.321	45.679	100.000
	4.339	9.763	5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1014	379	1393
	72.793	27.207	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-38 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	114	17	131
	87.023	12.977	100.000
	10.745	5.763	9.661
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	203	63	266
	76.316	23.684	100.000
	19.133	21.356	19.617
4 YEAR	333	51	384
	86.719	13.281	100.000
	31.385	17.288	28.319
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	334	129	463
	72.138	27.862	100.000
	31.480	43.729	34.145
NURSING	21	4	25
	84.000	16.000	100.000
	1.979	1.356	1.844
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	56	31	87
	64.368	35.632	100.000
	5.278	10.508	6.416
COLUMN SUMS	1061	295	1356
	78.245	21.755	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-39 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	111	20	131
	84.733	15.267	100.000
	10.804	6.079	9.661
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	195	71	266
	73.308	26.692	100.000
	18.987	21.581	19.617
4 YEAR	325	59	384
	84.635	15.365	100.000
	31.646	17.933	28.319
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	324	139	463
	69.978	30.022	100.000
	31.548	42.249	34.145
NURSING	19	6	25
	76.000	24.000	100.000
	1.850	1.824	1.844
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	53	34	87
	60.920	39.080	100.000
	5.161	10.334	6.416
COLUMN SUMS	1027	329	1356
	75.737	24.263	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-40 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR IND. MEMB. NAT. ASS: PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	107	24	131
	81.679	18.321	100.000
	10.830	6.522	9.661
2 YEARS & UNDER NOT V.T	179	87	266
	67.293	32.707	100.000
	18.117	23.641	19.617
4 YEAR	311	73	384
	80.990	19.010	100.000
	31.478	19.837	28.319
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	321	142	463
	69.330	30.670	100.000
	32.490	38.587	34.145
NURSING	18	7	25
	72.000	28.000	100.000
	1.822	1.902	1.844
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	52	35	87
	59.770	40.230	100.000
	5.263	9.511	6.416
COLUMN SUMS	988	368	1356
	72.861	27.139	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section G

Research Activities

TABLES 14-1 Through 14-15 Has Your Office Conducted Any Research Projects Relating to Financial Aid Topics Within the Past Two Years?

Just over 30 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey stated that their office had conducted research on topics related to financial aid within the past two years. As seen in Tables 14-1 through 14-5, the existence of office research projects on financial aid topics is related to the following: years of employment, educational level, and institutional size, control, and type (significant at the .01 level). For example, respondents from large institutions were over twice as likely to report the existence of office research projects as were respondents from small schools.

(The following section applies only to those Directors indicating that their office had conducted research projects within the past two years)

Approximately 44 percent of the Directors whose offices had conducted research projects stated that some/all of the projects were analytical (i.e., they employed tests of statistical significance). Although there were differences in responses to this question by years of employment, educational level, and institutional size, type, and control, none of the differences were significant at the .05 level (Tables 14-6 through 14-8).

Respondents were requested to state whether their research project(s) dealt with "student attitudes toward either financing postsecondary education or financial aid programs" or with the "impact of financial aid, e.g. on student or institutional decision making." There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in whether or not research projects dealt with student attitudes based on years of employment, educational level, or institutional type, control, and size. Table 14-9 displays the results of the above question based on institutional size.

The impact of financial aid programs was addressed in over one-half of the research projects which were conducted. There were no significant differences in whether the research related to the impact of financial aid programs based on years of employment (Table 14-10), educational level, or institutional size and type. However, institutional control was related to the above question, with private institutions being most likely (significant at the .01 level) to address the issue of the impact of financial aid programs (Table 14-11).

Respondents were asked to check any or all of three alternatives regarding how the results of their research projects were utilized:

(1) For internal financial aid office operations and policy making

(2) For dissemination within selected offices or segments of the institution

(3) For publication in a professional journal

Approximately 91 percent of the respondents stated that the results of their research were used for financial aid office operations and policy making. There were no significant differences in responses to this question based on years of employment, educational level, or institutional type, control, and size (Table 14-12).

Just over 60 percent of the respondents stated that the results of their research projects were used for institutional dissemination. As years of experience in the financial aid profession increased, there was a greater tendency to share the results of research projects within the respondents' institutions (Table 14-13).

Results of research projects were used for publication in professional journals by approximately 8 percent of the respondents. Publication in professional journals was most common among those holding either doctoral or associate degrees (Table 14-14). As seen in Table 14-15, publication in professional journals was most common among respondents employed in universities and graduate/professional schools.

Table 14-1 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO.YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	24	148	172
	13.953	86.047	100.000
	5.839	15.711	12.712
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	63	170	233
	27.039	72.961	100.000
	15.328	18.047	17.221
4-5 YEARS EXPER.	78	194	272
	28.676	71.324	100.000
	18.978	20.594	20.103
6-10 YEARS	157	281	438
	35.845	64.155	100.000
	38.200	29.830	32.373
11-15 YEARS	70	117	187
	37.433	62.567	100.000
	17.032	12.420	13.821
16+ YEARS	19	32	51
	37.255	62.745	100.000
	4.623	3.397	3.769
COLUMN SUMS	411	942	1353
	30.377	69.623	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-2 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Educational Level (Directors)

ROWS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED

COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	36	40	76
	47.368	52.632	100.000
	8.802	4.264	5.642
MASTERS	253	452	705
	35.887	64.113	100.000
	61.858	48.188	52.339
BACHELORS	85	282	367
	23.161	76.839	100.000
	20.782	30.064	27.246
ASSOCIATE	9	46	55
	16.364	83.636	100.000
	2.200	4.904	4.083
OTHER	26	118	144
	18.055	81.944	100.000
	6.357	12.580	10.690
COLUMN SUMS	409	938	1347
	30.364	69.636	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-3 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	89	398	487
	18.275	81.725	100.000
	21.760	42.251	36.047
1000-3999	132	288	420
	31.429	68.571	100.000
	32.274	30.573	31.088
4000-9999	91	132	223
	40.807	59.193	100.000
	22.249	14.013	16.506
10,000-19,999	59	86	145
	40.690	59.310	100.000
	14.425	9.130	10.733
20,000+	38	38	76
	50.000	50.000	100.000
	9.291	4.034	5.625
COLUMN SUMS	409	942	1351
	30.274	69.726	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-4 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Institutional Control (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	186	336	522
	35.632	64.368	100.000
	45.366	35.745	38.667
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	206	496	702
	29.345	70.655	100.000
	50.244	52.766	52.000
PROPRIETARY	18	108	126
	14.286	85.714	100.000
	4.390	11.489	9.333
COLUMN SUMS	410	940	1350
	30.370	69.630	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-5 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE: COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	23	101	124
	18.548	81.452	100.000
	5.764	11.050	9.444
<2YEARS NOT VOC TECH.	2	14	16
	12.500	87.500	100.000
	0.501	1.532	1.219
2 YEAR NOT VOC TECH	62	181	243
	25.514	74.486	100.000
	15.539	19.803	18.507
4 YEAR	115	259	374
	30.749	69.251	100.000
	28.822	28.337	28.484
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	175	274	449
	38.976	61.024	100.000
	43.860	29.978	34.196
NURSING	1	23	24
	4.167	95.833	100.000
	0.251	2.516	1.828
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	21	62	83
	25.301	74.699	100.000
	5.263	6.783	6.321
COLUMN SUMS	399	914	1313
	30.388	69.612	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-6 Analytical Research Projects by Educational Level (Directors)

ROWS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	22	14	36
	61.111	38.889	100.000
	12.360	6.393	9.069
MASTERS	103	142	245
	42.041	57.959	100.000
	57.865	64.840	61.713
BACHELORS	35	47	82
	42.683	57.317	100.000
	19.663	21.461	20.655
ASSOCIATE	5	4	9
	55.556	44.444	100.000
	2.809	1.826	2.267
OTHER	13	12	25
	52.000	48.000	100.000
	7.303	5.479	6.297
COLUMN SUMS	178	219	397
	44.836	55.164	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-7 Analytical Research Projects by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	38	46	84
	45.238	54.762	100.000
	21.348	21.005	21.159
1000-3999	48	78	126
	38.095	61.905	100.000
	26.966	35.616	31.738
4000-9999	44	46	90
	48.889	51.111	100.000
	24.719	21.005	22.670
10,000-19,999	28	31	59
	47.458	52.542	100.000
	15.730	14.155	14.861
20,000+	20	18	38
	52.632	47.368	100.000
	11.236	8.219	9.572
COLUMN SUMS	178	219	397
	44.836	55.164	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-8 Analytical Research Projects by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE: COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	10	12	22
	45.455	54.545	100.000
	5.848	5.530	5.670
<2YEARS NOT VOC TECH.	1	1	2
	50.000	50.000	100.000
	0.585	0.461	0.515
2 YEAR NOT VOC TECH	27	34	61
	44.262	55.738	100.000
	15.789	15.668	15.722
4 YEAR	47	63	110
	42.727	57.273	100.000
	27.485	29.032	28.351
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	80	91	171
	46.784	53.216	100.000
	46.784	41.935	44.072
NURSING	1		1
	100.000		100.000
	0.585		0.258
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	5	16	21
	23.810	76.190	100.000
	2.924	7.373	5.412
COLUMN SUMS	171	217	388
	44.072	55.928	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-9 Research Projects on Student Attitudes by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON STUD. ATTITUDES

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	27	59	86
	31.395	68.605	100.000
	19.286	22.868	21.608
1000-3999	46	81	127
	36.220	63.780	100.000
	32.857	31.395	31.910
4000-9999	32	58	90
	35.556	64.444	100.000
	22.857	22.481	22.613
10,000-19,999	21	37	58
	36.207	63.793	100.000
	15.000	14.341	14.573
20,000+	14	23	37
	37.838	62.162	100.000
	10.000	8.915	9.296
COLUMN SUMS	140	258	398
	35.176	64.824	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-10 Research Projects on Student Attitudes by Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO.YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON IMPACT OF FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	13	10	23
	56.522	43.478	100.000
	6.311	5.128	5.736
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	32	30	62
	51.613	48.387	100.000
	15.534	15.385	15.461
4-5 YEARS EXPER.	38	39	77
	49.351	50.649	100.000
	18.447	20.000	19.202
6-10 YEARS	83	69	152
	54.605	45.395	100.000
	40.291	35.385	37.905
11-15 YEARS	29	39	68
	42.647	57.353	100.000
	14.078	20.000	16.958
16+ YEARS	11	8	19
	57.895	42.105	100.000
	5.340	4.103	4.738
COLUMN SUMS	206	195	401
	51.372	48.628	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-11 Research Projects on the Impact of Student Financial Aid Programs (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFCATION: COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON IMPACT OF FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	78	104	182
	42.857	57.143	100.000
	38.049	53.333	45.500
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	119	82	201
	59.204	40.796	100.000
	58.049	42.051	50.250
PROPRIETARY	8	9	17
	47.059	52.941	100.000
	3.902	4.615	4.250
COLUMN SUMS	205	195	400
	51.250	48.750	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-12 Research Results Used for Internal Office Operations and Policy Making by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR INTERNAL OPERATIONS & POLICY MAKING

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	81	8	89
	91.011	8.989	100.000
	21.600	23.529	21.760
1000-3999	121	11	132
	91.667	8.333	100.000
	32.267	32.353	32.274
4000-9999	85	6	91
	93.407	6.593	100.000
	22.667	17.647	22.249
10,000-19,999	53	6	59
	89.831	10.169	100.000
	14.133	17.647	14.425
20,000+	35	3	38
	92.105	7.895	100.000
	9.333	8.824	9.291
COLUMN SUMS	375	34	409
	91.687	8.313	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-13 Research Results Used for Institutional Dissemination by Years of Employment (Directors)

ROWS = NO.YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR INSTITUTIONAL DISSEMINATION

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	11	13	24
	45.833	54.167	100.000
	4.435	7.975	5.839
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	33	30	63
	52.381	47.619	100.000
	13.306	18.405	15.328
4-5 YEARS EXPER.	45	33	78
	57.692	42.308	100.000
	18.145	20.245	18.978
6-10 YEARS	103	54	157
	65.605	34.395	100.000
	41.532	33.129	38.200
11-15 YEARS	41	29	70
	58.571	41.429	100.000
	16.532	17.791	17.032
16+ YEARS	15	4	19
	78.947	21.053	100.000
	6.048	2.454	4.623
COLUMN SUMS	248	163	411
	60.341	39.659	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-14 Research Results Used for Publication in a Professional Journal by Educational Level (Directors)

ROWS = EDUCATION: HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED

COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR PUBLICATION IN A PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	7	29	36
	19.444	80.556	100.000
	21.875	7.692	8.802
MASTERS	20	233	253
	7.905	92.095	100.000
	62.500	61.804	61.858
BACHELORS	3	82	85
	3.529	96.471	100.000
	9.375	21.751	20.782
ASSOCIATE	1	8	9
	11.111	88.889	100.000
	3.125	2.122	2.200
OTHER	1	25	26
	3.846	96.154	100.000
	3.125	6.631	6.357
COLUMN SUMS	32	377	409
	7.824	92.176	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-15 Research Results Used for Publication in a Professional Journal by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:

COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR PUBLICATION IN A PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.		23	23
		100.000	100.000
		6.267	5.764
<2YEARS NOT VOC TECH.		2	2
		100.000	100.000
		0.545	0.501
2 YEAR NOT VOC TECH	3	59	62
	4.839	95.161	100.000
	9.375	16.076	15.539
4 YEAR	7	108	115
	6.087	93.913	100.000
	21.875	29.428	28.822
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	20	155	175
	11.429	88.571	100.000
	62.500	42.234	43.860
NURSING		1	1
		100.000	100.000
		0.272	0.251
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	2	19	21
	9.524	90.476	100.000
	6.250	5.177	5.263
COLUMN SUMS	32	367	399
	8.020	91.980	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Appendix A

Financial Aid Directors' Salaries
by Institutional Type, Control, and Size
and by Geographic Area

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 4 YEAR+ <7000
TYPE AND SIZE

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA				3 15.789 30.000	5 26.316 22.727	3 15.789 18.750	1 5.263 11.111	4 21.053 25.000		3 15.789 60.000	19 100.000 22.619
SASPAA				5 29.412 50.000	5 29.412 22.727	4 23.529 25.000	1 5.882 11.111	1 5.882 6.250		1 5.882 20.000	17 100.000 20.238
MASPAA				1 7.143 10.000	2 14.286 9.091	5 35.714 31.250	1 7.143 11.111	5 35.714 31.250			14 100.000 16.667
SWASPAA		1 6.250 100.000	2 12.500 66.667		5 31.250 22.727	1 6.250 6.250	3 18.750 33.333	3 18.750 18.750		1 6.250 20.000	16 100.000 19.048
RMASPAA				1 8.333 10.000	5 41.667 22.727	3 25.000 18.750	2 16.667 22.222	1 8.333 6.250			12 100.000 14.286
WASPAA			1 16.667 33.333				1 16.667 11.111	2 33.333 12.500	2 33.333 100.000		6 100.000 7.143
COLUMN SUMS		1 1.190 100.000	3 3.571 100.000	10 11.905 100.000	22 26.190 100.000	16 19.048 100.000	9 10.714 100.000	16 19.048 100.000	2 2.381 100.000	5 5.952 100.000	84 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 4 YEAR+
TYPE AND SIZE 7-19999

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA					2 15.385 33.333	1 7.692 5.000	3 23.077 15.789	6 46.154 17.647	1 7.692 9.091		13 100.000 13.542
SASPAA			1 4.545 100.000	1 4.545 100.000	2 9.091 33.333	7 31.818 35.000	2 9.091 10.526	7 31.818 20.588	2 9.091 18.182		22 100.000 22.917
MASPAA					1 4.545 16.667	4 18.182 20.000	3 13.636 15.789	10 45.455 29.412	3 13.636 27.273	1 4.545 25.000	22 100.000 22.917
SWASPAA					1 7.692 16.667	5 38.462 25.000	3 23.077 15.789	4 30.769 11.765			13 100.000 13.542
RMASPAA						3 37.500 15.000	3 37.500 15.789	1 12.500 2.941	1 12.500 9.091		8 100.000 8.333
WASPAA							5 27.778 26.316	6 33.333 17.647	4 22.222 36.364	3 16.667 75.000	18 100.000 18.750
COLUMN SUMS			1 1.042 100.000	1 1.042 100.000	6 6.250 100.000	20 20.833 100.000	19 19.792 100.000	34 35.417 100.000	11 11.458 100.000	4 4.167 100.000	96 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE = PUBLIC 4 YEAR+ 20,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
MASPAA							1	1	3	2	7
							14.286	14.286	42.857	28.571	100.000
							14.286	11.111	23.077	12.500	13.208
SASPAA					1	2					3
					33.333	66.667					100.000
					50.000	33.333					5.660
NASPAA					1	3	3	5	4	6	22
					4.545	13.636	13.636	22.727	18.182	27.273	100.000
					50.000	50.000	42.857	55.556	30.769	37.500	41.509
SWASPAA							2		1	2	5
							40.000		20.000	40.000	100.000
							28.571		7.692	12.500	9.434
RMASPAA						1		1	1		3
						33.333		33.333	33.333		100.000
						16.667		11.111	7.692		5.660
WASPAA							1	2	4	6	13
							7.692	15.385	30.769	46.154	100.000
							14.286	22.222	30.769	37.500	24.528
COLUMN SUMS					2	6	7	9	13	16	53
					3.774	11.321	13.208	16.981	24.528	30.189	100.000
					100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE <4000

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		1 11.111 50.000		3 33.333 37.500	3 33.333 25.000	1 11.111 20.000	1 11.111 33.333				9 100.000 29.032
SASPAA				3 75.000 37.500	1 25.000 8.333						4 100.000 12.903
MASPAA					3 50.000 25.000	2 33.333 40.000		1 16.667 100.000			6 100.000 19.355
SWASPAA				1 33.333 12.500	2 66.667 16.667						3 100.000 9.677
RMASPAA		1 25.000 50.000			1 25.000 8.333	1 25.000 20.000	1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 12.903
WASPAA				1 20.000 12.500	2 40.000 16.667	1 20.000 20.000	1 20.000 33.333				5 100.000 16.129
COLUMN SUMS		2 6.452 100.000		8 25.806 100.000	12 38.710 100.000	5 16.129 100.000	3 9.677 100.000	1 3.226 100.000			31 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE 4,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA			1 20.000 100.000	2 40.000 33.333		2 40.000 40.000					5 100.000 20.833
SASPAA				1 25.000 16.667		1 25.000 20.000	1 25.000 20.000	1 25.000 25.000			4 100.000 16.667
MASPAA				3 37.500 50.000			2 25.000 40.000	1 12.500 25.000	2 25.000 100.000		8 100.000 33.333
SWASPAA						1 50.000 20.000	1 50.000 20.000				2 100.000 8.333
RMASPAA						1 33.333 20.000	1 33.333 20.000	1 33.333 25.000			3 100.000 12.500
WASPAA								1 50.000 25.000		1 50.000 100.000	2 100.000 8.333
COLUMN SUMS			1 4.167 100.000	6 25.000 100.000		5 20.833 100.000	5 20.833 100.000	4 16.667 100.000	2 8.333 100.000	1 4.167 100.000	24 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 2 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE <4000

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		2	1	4	4	4	3				18
		11.111	5.556	22.222	22.222	22.222	16.667				100.000
		33.333	20.000	28.571	23.529	44.444	37.500				26.866
SASPAA	2	3	2	2	3	1					13
	15.385	23.077	15.385	15.385	23.077	7.692					100.000
	50.000	50.000	40.000	14.286	17.647	11.111					19.403
MASPAA		1	1	1	6	2	2	1	1		15
		6.667	6.667	6.667	40.000	13.333	13.333	6.667	6.667		100.000
		16.667	20.000	7.143	35.294	22.222	25.000	50.000	100.000		22.388
SWASPAA	2			4	1	2	2				11
	18.182			36.364	9.091	18.182	18.182				100.000
	50.000			28.571	5.882	22.222	25.000				16.418
RMASPAA			1	3	2		1				7
			14.286	42.857	28.571		14.286				100.000
			20.000	21.429	11.765		12.500				10.448
WASPAA					1			1		1	3
					33.333			33.333		33.333	100.000
					5.882			50.000		100.000	4.478
COLUMN SUMS	4	6	5	14	17	9	8	2	1	1	67
	5.970	8.955	7.463	20.896	25.373	13.433	11.940	2.985	1.493	1.493	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC 2 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE 4,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA				2	3	2	3	7	1	1	19
				10.526	15.789	10.526	15.789	36.842	5.263	5.263	100.000
				40.000	30.000	28.571	14.286	41.176	11.111	25.000	26.027
SASPAA				1			3	1	1		6
				16.667			50.000	16.667	16.667		100.000
				20.000			14.286	5.882	11.111		8.219
MASPAA				1	3	2	8	3	4	1	22
				4.545	13.636	9.091	36.364	13.636	18.182	4.545	100.000
				20.000	30.000	28.571	38.095	17.647	44.444	25.000	30.137
SWASPAA				1	4	1	4	1			11
				9.091	36.364	9.091	36.364	9.091			100.000
				20.000	40.000	14.286	19.048	5.882			15.068
RMASPAA						1					1
						100.000					100.000
						14.286					1.370
WASPAA						1	3	5	3	2	14
						7.143	21.429	35.714	21.429	14.286	100.000
						14.286	14.286	29.412	33.333	50.000	19.178
COLUMN SUMS				5	10	7	21	17	9	4	73
				6.849	13.699	9.589	28.767	23.288	12.329	5.479	100.000
				100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE = INDEP 4 YEAR+ <4000

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	1	2	6	9	7	6	6	2			39
	2.564	5.128	15.385	23.077	17.949	15.385	15.385	5.128			100.000
	50.000	33.333	28.571	33.333	31.818	42.857	60.000	40.000			36.111
SASPAA	1		5	4	3	1					14
	7.143		35.714	28.571	21.429	7.143					100.000
	50.000		23.810	14.815	13.636	7.143					12.963
WASPAA		1	3	9	6	2	1		1		23
		4.348	13.043	39.130	26.087	8.696	4.348		4.348		100.000
		16.667	14.286	33.333	27.273	14.286	10.000		100.000		21.296
SWASPAA			3	3	3	1		1			11
			27.273	27.273	27.273	9.091		9.091			100.000
			14.286	11.111	13.636	7.143		20.000			10.185
RMASPAA						1					1
						100.000					100.000
						7.143					0.926
WASPAA		3	4	2	3	3	3	2			20
		15.000	20.000	10.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	10.000			100.000
		50.000	19.048	7.407	13.636	21.429	30.000	40.000			18.519
COLUMN SUMS	2	6	21	27	22	14	10	5	1		108
	1.852	5.556	19.444	25.000	20.370	12.963	9.259	4.630	0.926		100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE = INDEP 4 YEAR+ 4,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		1	1	4	8	4	5	7	7	8	45
		2.222	2.222	8.889	17.778	8.889	11.111	15.556	15.556	17.778	100.000
		100.000	50.000	66.667	61.538	28.571	35.714	63.636	58.333	80.000	54.217
SASPAA					1	1			2		4
					25.000	25.000			50.000		100.000
					7.692	7.143			16.667		4.819
WASPAA			1		3	3	5	2	2	1	17
			5.882		17.647	17.647	29.412	11.765	11.765	5.882	100.000
			50.000		23.077	21.429	35.714	18.182	16.667	10.000	20.482
SWASPAA				1		1	3			1	6
				16.667		16.667	50.000			16.667	100.000
				16.667		7.143	21.429			10.000	7.229
RMASPAA						1					1
						100.000					100.000
						7.143					1.205
WASPAA				1	1	4	1	2	1		10
				10.000	10.000	40.000	10.000	20.000	10.000		100.000
				16.667	7.692	28.571	7.143	18.182	8.333		12.048
COLUMN SUMS		1	2	6	13	14	14	11	12	10	83
		1.205	2.410	7.229	15.663	16.867	16.867	13.253	14.458	12.048	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE <1000

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	2	7	7	5	1						22
	9.091	31.818	31.818	22.727	4.545						100.000
	15.385	17.073	28.000	19.231	7.692						17.054
SASPAA	2	11	5	8	3	2	1				32
	6.250	34.375	15.625	25.000	9.375	6.250	3.125				100.000
	15.385	26.829	20.000	30.769	23.077	28.571	50.000				24.806
MASPAA	8	15	9	11	4	4		1			52
	15.385	28.846	17.308	21.154	7.692	7.692		1.923			100.000
	61.538	36.585	36.000	42.308	30.769	57.143		50.000			40.310
SWASPAA		3	1	1	2		1				8
		37.500	12.500	12.500	25.000		12.500				100.000
		7.317	4.000	3.846	15.385		50.000				6.202
RMASPAA	1	3	1	1	2			1			9
	11.111	33.333	11.111	11.111	22.222			11.111			100.000
	7.692	7.317	4.000	3.846	15.385			50.000			6.977
WASPAA		2	2		1	1					6
		33.333	33.333		16.667	16.667					100.000
		4.878	8.000		7.692	14.286					4.651
COLUMN SUMS	13	41	25	26	13	7	2	2			129
	10.078	31.783	19.380	20.155	10.078	5.426	1.550	1.550			100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000			100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE 1-1,999

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		2	7	12	6	6	3	3			39
		5.128	17.949	30.769	15.385	15.385	7.692	7.692			100.000
		18.182	23.333	42.857	37.500	42.857	33.333	75.000			33.913
SASPAA	1	2	6	3	2	1	1				16
	6.250	12.500	37.500	18.750	12.500	6.250	6.250				100.000
	33.333	18.182	20.000	10.714	12.500	7.143	11.111				13.913
MASPAA	1	3	12	12	4	5	3	1			41
	2.439	7.317	29.268	29.268	9.756	12.195	7.317	2.439			100.000
	33.333	27.273	40.000	42.857	25.000	35.714	33.333	25.000			35.652
SWASPAA	1	2	4		2	2					11
	9.091	18.182	36.364		18.182	18.182					100.000
	33.333	18.182	13.333		12.500	14.286					9.565
RMASPAA		1	1		1		1				4
		25.000	25.000		25.000		25.000				100.000
		9.091	3.333		6.250		11.111				3.478
WASPAA		1		1	1		1				4
		25.000		25.000	25.000		25.000				100.000
		9.091		3.571	6.250		11.111				3.478
COLUMN SUMS	3	11	30	28	16	14	9	4			115
	2.609	9.565	26.087	24.348	13.913	12.174	7.826	3.478			100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000			100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE 2,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		1 5.000 50.000	1 5.000 100.000	2 10.000 28.571	6 30.000 66.667	2 10.000 50.000	6 30.000 60.000	2 10.000 50.000			20 100.000 54.054
SASPAA		1 50.000 50.000			1 50.000 11.111						2 100.000 5.405
MASPAA				3 25.000 42.857	2 16.667 22.222	2 16.667 50.000	3 25.000 30.000	2 16.667 50.000			12 100.000 32.432
SWASPAA											
RMASPAA				1 100.000 14.286							1 100.000 2.703
WASPAA				1 50.000 14.286			1 50.000 10.000				2 100.000 5.405
COLUMN SUMS		2 5.405 100.000	1 2.703 100.000	7 18.919 100.000	9 24.324 100.000	4 10.811 100.000	10 27.027 100.000	4 10.811 100.000			37 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP
TYPE AND SIZE 2 YEAR

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000- 10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	1 7.143 10.000	2 14.286 28.571	3 21.429 42.857	3 21.429 50.000	2 14.286 40.000	1 7.143 100.000	1 7.143 50.000	1 7.143 25.000			14 100.000 33.333
SASPAA	6 46.154 60.000	2 15.385 28.571	2 15.385 28.571	2 15.385 33.333				1 7.692 25.000			13 100.000 30.952
MASPAA	3 37.500 30.000		1 12.500 14.286	1 12.500 16.667	2 25.000 40.000			1 12.500 25.000			8 100.000 19.048
SWASPAA		2 66.667 28.571					1 33.333 50.000				3 100.000 7.143
MWASPAA					1 100.000 20.000						1 100.000 2.381
WASPAA		1 33.333 14.286	1 33.333 14.286					1 33.333 25.000			3 100.000 7.143
COLUMN SUMS	10 23.810 100.000	7 16.667 100.000	7 16.667 100.000	6 14.286 100.000	5 11.905 100.000	1 2.381 100.000	2 4.762 100.000	4 9.524 100.000			42 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF
TYPE AND SIZE

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA				3 100.000 100.000							3 100.000 42.857
SASPAA					1 100.000 33.333						1 100.000 14.286
WASPAA					1 100.000 33.333						1 100.000 14.286
SWASPAA					1 50.000 33.333	1 50.000 100.000					2 100.000 28.571
RMASPAA											
MASPAA											
COLUMN SUMS				3 42.857 100.000	3 42.857 100.000	1 14.286 100.000					7 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP GRAD/ PROF
TYPE AND SIZE

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA		1 5.556 50.000	2 11.111 25.000	6 33.333 100.000	3 16.667 75.000	1 5.556 33.333	2 11.111 66.667	2 11.111 100.000	1 5.556 100.000		18 100.000 62.069
SASPAA			2 100.000 25.000								2 100.000 6.897
WASPAA		1 25.000 50.000	2 50.000 25.000			1 25.000 33.333					4 100.000 13.793
SWASPAA						1 100.000 33.333					1 100.000 3.448
RMASPAA											
MASPAA			2 50.000 25.000		1 25.000 25.000		1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 13.793
COLUMN SUMS		2 6.897 100.000	8 27.586 100.000	6 20.690 100.000	4 13.793 100.000	3 10.345 100.000	3 10.345 100.000	2 6.897 100.000	1 3.448 100.000		29 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE = PUBLIC& INDEP NURSING

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA				1 25.000 33.333	1 25.000 100.000	1 25.000 100.000		1 25.000 100.000			4 100.000 36.364
SASPAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
MASPAA				2 50.000 66.667			1 25.000 100.000		1 25.000 100.000		4 100.000 36.364
SWASPAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
RMASPAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
WASPAA											
COLUMN SUMS		3 27.273 100.000		3 27.273 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000		11 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE = PUBLIC& INDEP VOC.TEC

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA			2 66.667 33.333	1 33.333 50.000							3 100.000 8.571
SASPAA	1 16.667 50.000		1 16.667 16.667	1 16.667 50.000	3 50.000 50.000						6 100.000 17.143
MASPAA	1 6.250 50.000	2 12.500 100.000	1 6.250 16.667		2 12.500 33.333	5 31.250 55.556	2 12.500 66.667	1 6.250 50.000	2 12.500 66.667		16 100.000 45.714
SWASPAA			1 25.000 16.667			2 50.000 22.222	1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 11.429
RMASPAA					1 33.333 16.667	1 33.333 11.111		1 33.333 50.000			3 100.000 8.571
WASPAA			1 33.333 16.667			1 33.333 11.111			1 33.333 33.333		3 100.000 8.571
COLUMN SUMS	2 5.714 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	6 17.143 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	6 17.143 100.000	9 25.714 100.000	3 8.571 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	3 8.571 100.000		35 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PROPRI.
TYPE AND SIZE VOC.TEC

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	1 8.333 20.000	3 25.000 27.273	1 8.333 8.333	3 25.000 27.273		2 16.667 50.000			1 8.333 33.333	1 8.333 20.000	12 100.000 21.818
SASPAA			1 20.000 8.333	3 60.000 27.273		1 20.000 25.000					5 100.000 9.091
MASPAA		1 9.091 9.091	7 63.636 58.333	1 9.091 9.091	1 9.091 33.333				1 9.091 33.333		11 100.000 20.000
SWASPAA	1 16.667 20.000	2 33.333 18.182	3 50.000 25.000								6 100.000 10.909
RMASPAA	2 40.000 40.000			1 20.000 9.091	1 20.000 33.333				1 20.000 33.333		5 100.000 9.091
WASPAA	1 6.250 20.000	5 31.250 45.455		3 18.750 27.273	1 6.250 33.333	1 6.250 25.000	1 6.250 100.000			4 25.000 80.000	16 100.000 29.091
COLUMN SUMS	5 9.091 100.000	11 20.000 100.000	12 21.818 100.000	11 20.000 100.000	3 5.455 100.000	4 7.273 100.000	1 1.818 100.000		3 5.455 100.000	5 9.091 100.000	55 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = ALL OTHER PROPRI.
TYPE AND SIZE

ROWS = REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER $9,000	$9,000-10,999	$11,000 12,999	$13,000 14,999	$15,000 16,999	$17,000 18,999	$19,000 20,999	$21,000 23,999	$24,000 26,999	$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPAA	1 12.500 20.000	1 12.500 12.500		1 12.500 50.000	3 37.500 42.857	1 12.500 100.000		1 12.500 50.000			8 100.000 24.242
SASPAA	2 22.222 40.000	1 11.111 12.500	4 44.444 50.000	1 11.111 50.000				1 11.111 50.000			9 100.000 27.273
MASPAA	1 10.000 20.000	4 40.000 50.000	2 20.000 25.000		3 30.000 42.857						10 100.000 30.303
SWASPAA	1 33.333 20.000	2 66.667 25.000									3 100.000 9.091
RMASPAA											
WASPAA			2 66.667 25.000		1 33.333 14.286						3 100.000 9.091
COLUMN SUMS	5 15.152 100.000	8 24.242 100.000	8 24.242 100.000	2 6.061 100.000	7 21.212 100.000	1 3.030 100.000		2 6.061 100.000			33 100.000 100.000

478

Appendix B

1974 Survey Questionnaire

NASFAA

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

CENTRAL OFFICE AND PLACEMENT SERVICE
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 226
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 785-0453

March 11, 1974

Dear Director of Financial Aid:

I know that you are vitally concerned about the role of the financial aid administrator in post-secondary education today and in the future. The National Council of NASFAA shares this concern and therefore has commissioned William J. Bushaw of the University of Iowa to conduct the enclosed survey to determine the function, training, status and other relevant information about our rapidly expanding profession. It is hoped that the data obtained can be used to upgrade the aid administrator through better training, more adequate staffing, greater stature within the institution, and improved compensation.

The questionnaire consists of two sections. Section One applies to all financial aid administrators at your institution. Because of the cost factor, I would deeply appreciate your making sufficient copies to allow each member of your professional staff to complete the first portion of this survey.

Section Two pertains to the financial aid office and requires completion only by the director. All individual responses will be held strictly confidential.

The National Council urges you to take the relatively brief time needed to complete this important survey and return it to Mr. Bushaw at the address below within two weeks. Thanks so much for your cooperation in this vital survey.

Sincerely,

Eunice L. Edwards

(Mrs.) Eunice L. Edwards
President

Return Surveys to:

NASFAA Professional Survey
The University of Iowa
Office of Financial Aids
106 Old Dental Building
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

SECTION ONE: The questions in this section should be answered by all professional financial aid administrators. Please answer each question if at all possible. Give the best answer you can, and if desired, explain any answer in the "comments" section. To economize, we are asking each Director to reproduce enough copies of Section One for distribution to the professional staff.

1. To support professional development of Aid Officers, does your institution provide released time and/or pay expenses for any of the following? (Check all that apply.)

Released Time	Pay Expenses	
___	___	Aid Meetings within state
___	___	Aid Meetings out-of-state
___	___	Coursework related to job
___	___	Outside professional activities
___	___	Attendance at workshops
	___	Office subscriptions
	___	Individual membership in state aid association
	___	Individual membership in regional and national aid association

2. In your judgment, what areas of academic preparation would be especially useful for Aid Officers? Which did you have?

Useful	I Had	
___	___	Data Processing
___	___	Accounting
___	___	Statistics
___	___	Counseling
___	___	Law
___	___	Government
___	___	Research
___	___	Office Management
___	___	Internship/Practicum in Financial Aid
___	___	Financial Aid Administration

3. What types of information for job orientation are especially useful for New Aid Officers? Which did you have?

Useful	I Had	
___	___	Written Job Description
___	___	Limits of Authority
___	___	Institutional Policies
___	___	Office Administration
___	___	Overview of Yearly Work
___	___	Program Procedures
___	___	Minority/Poverty Issues
___	___	Inter-Office Relationships
___	___	Procedures Manual
___	___	Budget Preparation

4. Ideally, what is the single best way for new Aid Officers to get practical experience? Check those you had.

Single Best	I Had
___Internship/Practicum/Assistantship	___Internship/Practicum/Assistantship
___Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)	___Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)
___Workshop (2-5 Days)	___Workshop (2-5 Days)
___On-the -job Training	___On-the-job Training

5. In what ways would you prefer to keep current? Assume all are available and check only those you would most likely use.

___Occasional coursework
___Workshop (2-5 Days)
___Professional meetings--state-wide
___Professional meetings--regional
___Professional meetings--national
___Financial Aid newsletters
___The Journal of Student Financial Aid
___Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)
___Self-study materials
___Meeting periodically with Regional Office of Education Officials
___Other (Please specify.) _____

6. Check the most useful topics for inclusion in workshops to train new Aid Officers and to keep experienced Aid Officers current.

New	Experienced	
___	___	Personnel Management and Office Organization
___	___	Research Methods and Findings
___	___	Data Processing Applications
___	___	Report Preparation (including budget preparation)
___	___	Need Analysis
___	___	Operation of Student Employment Services
___	___	Status of Student Aid Legislation
___	___	Interviewing Techniques
___	___	Fund Raising or Developing New Sources of Aid
___	___	Minority/Poverty Issues

7. Which of the following have you done: (Check as many as apply.)

___Read financial aid newsletters regularly.
___Read The Journal of Student Financial Aid regularly.
___Read The Chronical of Higher Education or "Higher Education and National Affairs" regularly.
___Attended an aid association meeting in the past year.
___Done committee work for an aid association in the past three years.
___Participated in an aid meeting (read paper, led discussion, appeared on a panel, etc) in the past three years.
___Held an office in an aid association in the past three years.
___Served as a consultant off campus in the past three years.
___Attended professional association meetings other than those of a financial aid association inthe past year.
___Published or submitted for publication an article in a professional journal in the past three years.

8. Are you a member of a state financial aid association?

___Yes
___No
___There is not an aid association in my state.

9. Are you a member of a regional aid association?

___Yes - EASFAA
___Yes - MASFAA
___Yes - RMASFAA
___Yes - SASFAA
___Yes - SWASFAA
___Yes - WASFAA
___No

10. In developing the Financial Aid Profession further, how important do you rate each of the following?
Rate each item according to the following scale:
1=Very important
2=Important
3=Not so important

___Hold seminars on the use of technology in the financial aid office.
___Develop a written code of ethics.
___Conduct more research.
___Encourage the establishment of graduate training programs.
___Provide immediate training for newly appointed aid officers.
___Provide opportunities for professional growth for those in smaller aid operations.
___Develop self-study materials for new aid officers.
___Provide training in effective legislative advocacy.
___Establish a recommended set of credentials for aid officers.
___Other (Please specify.) _____

11. What is your age?

___21-24
___25-30
___31-35
___36-40
___41-45
___46-50
___51-55
___56-60
___Over 60

12. What is your sex?

___Male
___Female

13. What is your race or ethnic background?

___Black American
___American Indian
___Oriental American
___Spanish American
___American Caucasian

14. What is the highest degree you have earned?

___High School Diploma or less
___Associate Arts or 2-year certificate
___Bachelors
___Masters
___Graduate work which led to a degree between the Masters and Doctorate
___Doctorate

15. Are any of your degrees from the institution at which you are currently working?

___Yes - Undergraduate
___Yes - Graduate
___Both
___No

16. Are you presently enrolled in a degree program?

___Yes - Associate Arts/2-year certificate
___Yes - Bachelors
___Yes - Masters
___Yes - Mid-Degree (i.e., Ed.S.)
___Yes - Doctorate
___No

17. Do you plan to pursue a higher degree in the future?

___Yes - Associate Arts/2-year certificate
___Yes - Bachelors
___Yes - Masters
___Yes - Mid-Degree (i.e., Ed.S.)
___Yes - Doctorate
___No
___Uncertain

18. Which best describes your present position?

___Full-time Aid Administrator
___Part-time Aid Administrator
If part-time, list other responsibilities, if any.

_____

_____

19. How long have you worked in Financial Aid?

___Less than 1 year
___1-2 years
___3-4 years
___5-7 years
___8-10 years
___11-15 years
___Over 15 years

20. What is your current salary?

___Under $5,000
___$ 5,000 - 7,499
___$ 7,500 - 9,999
___$10,000 - 11,999
___$12,000 - 13,999
___$14,000 - 15,999
___$16,000 - 17,999
___$18,000 - 19,999
___$20,000 - 21,999
___$22,000 or more

21. What was your position just previous to the present one? Two positions ago?

Most Recent	2nd Most Recent	
___	___	Director of Financial Aid at another school
___	___	Financial Aid Officer at another school
___	___	Financial Aid Officer at the same school
___	___	Employed in Higher Education in a capacity other than Financial Aid
___	___	Employed in Elementary/Secondary Education
___	___	Employed in Government Service
___	___	Employed in Private Business
___	___	Military
___	___	Student
___	___	Other (Please specify.) _____

This completes the questions asked of all Aid Officers. Thank you for your cooperation.

Comments:

SECTION TWO: These questions deal with staffing and office operations and are to be answered by the Director of Financial Aid.

22. Your institution is classified as which one of the following?

___Public 2 year or less
___Public 4 year only
___Public 4 year and beyond
___Public Graduate/Professional only
___Private 2 year or less
___Private 4 year only
___Private 4 year and beyond
___Private Graduate/Professional only
___Proprietary

23. What is the full-time enrollment at your institution?

___ 0 - 249
___250 - 499
___500 - 749
___750 - 999
___1000 - 2499
___2500 - 4999
___5000 - 7499
___7500 - 9999
___10,000 - 14,999
___15,000 - 19,999
___20,000 or more

24. Where does the Office of Student Financial Aid report within your institution? (Check one.)

___Directly to the President
___To Chief Administrator for Student Services (Either a Vice-President, Dean, or Director)
___To a second level student personnel officer (Assistant Dean for Student Services, Registrar, Director of Admissions)
___To Chief Fiscal Officer (Vice-President for Finance)
___To second level fiscal officer (Cashier, Chief Accountant)
___Other (Please specify) _____

25. How many people do you officially report through to reach the President of the institution?

___None
___1
___2
___3
___4
___5 or more

26. How long have you been a Financial Aid Director?

___Less than 1 year
___1 - 2 years
___3 - 4 years
___5 - 7 years
___ 8 - 10 years
___11 - 15 years
___Over 15 years

27. How much financial aid experience do you consider necessary to hold your present position? How much did you have when assuming it?

Necessary Now		I Had
___	Under 1 year	___
___	1 - 3 years	___
___	4 - 5 years	___
___	Over 5 years	___

28. How many full-time professional staff assistants do you employ? _____

29. How many full-time clerical staff do you employ? _____

30. How many part-time assistants do you employ? (Include both clerical and professional) _____

31. Which of the following operational activities are the responsibility of the financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

___Informational acitivities, i.e., ounseling students, visiting secondary schools and community colleges, meeting with community and fraternal organizations.

___Needs analysis (ascertaining need and seeing that program qualifications are met)

___Aid packaging (awarding type of aid and notifying awardee)

___Authorizing the disbursement of funds to awardee (notifying fiscal authority of amount and form of award so a check can be prepared)

___Disbursing funds to awardee (actually handling payment of funds or establishing credit for awardee)

___Do fund accounting (maintaining own office records regarding program expenditures rather than receiving monthly statements from the Business Office)

___Fiscal reporting (preparing summation of activities and expenditures)

___Loan collections (periodic billing for and bookkeeping of loan repayments)

___Placement or referral of individuals for Work-Study positions.

___Placement or referral of individuals for regular part-time employment.

32. Where are each of the following programs administered at your institution?

Use the following code for designating location:
1=By the Aid Office
2=By some other office
3=By both the Aid and some other office
4=Aid not available

___National Direct Student Loan
___Educational Opportunity Grant
___College Work-Study Program
___Health Professions Programs
___Nursing Program
___Law Enforcement Education Program
___Federally Insured or State Guaranteed Loan Program
___Regular Part-Time Jobs
___Institutional Loans
___Academic Scholarships to Entering Freshmen
___Academic Scholarships to Enrolled Undergraduates
___Institutional Grants
___Graduate Scholarships
___Graduate Assistantships
___Cuban Loan Program
___State Scholarships
___State Grants

33. Number of students who applied for aid through the institution in 1972-73. _____

34. List the number of students assisted and the total amount of funds distributed under each of the following aid categories for program year 1972-73. Include Federal, State, and Institutional shares.

Loans	Number of Students	1972-73 Amounts
Institutionally Based (i.e., college-based federal programs, institutional Federally Insured Loans, institutional long and short-term loans)	_____	_____
Non-Institutionally Based (i.e., Federally Insured or State Guaranteed Student Loans through a private lender, loans through state agencies, and loans from private or fraternal organizations)	_____	_____
TOTAL LOANS	_____	_____

34. (Continued)

COMMENTS:

Scholarships	Number of Students	1972-73 Amounts
Institutionally Based (i.e., Institutional scholarships or endowment funded scholarships institutionally administered)	_____	_____
Non-institutionally Based (i.e., State scholarship program, donor selected scholarships)	_____	_____
TOTAL SCHOLARSHIPS	_____	_____
Grants		
Institutionally Based (i.e., college-based federal programs, athletic grants-in-aid, institutional grants, activities awards)	_____	_____
Non-institutionally Based (i.e., VA, Social Security, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Bonus Board Benefits, State tuition grants)	_____	_____
TOTAL GRANTS	_____	_____
Employment (i.e., College Work-Study, regular part-time employment, graduate assistantships)	_____	_____
TOTAL ALL AID	_____	_____
TOTAL ALL AID (Unduplicated count)	_____	

Thank you for cooperating in this survey. If you have any other comments concerning or ideas regarding professional development, feel free to make them in the comments section. Upon completing the survey, staple the flap and mail. No postage is required.

Appendix C

1977 Survey Questionnaire

NASFAA

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

CENTRAL OFFICE AND PLACEMENT SERVICE
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 228
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 785-0453

August, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Recently the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators formed a special committee to gather, study, and report on selected characteristics of financial aid administrators, the programs they administer, and their opinions on current issues in financial aid. The special committee consists of Harvey Grotrian and Robert Holmes of the University of Michigan and Karen Dickinson of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

The questionnaire developed by the committee is enclosed. As you can see the questionnaire represents an ambitious effort to learn more about individuals who are employed in the financial aid profession. I urge you to promptly complete the questionnaire and return it using the prepaid addressed envelope which is also enclosed.

The questionnaire is to be completed only by individuals who are employed in financial aid at educational institutions. We are particularly aware of the sensitive nature of some of the information you are asked to provide. Therefore, the study has been designed so that your replies will be treated with the strictest confidence and so that it will not be possible to connect anyone with his or her responses.

It is crucial that any study of this type be based upon a high percentage of those surveyed. Last month the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators published a study to which nearly 75 percent of the MASFAA members contributed. Given the ease with which this questionnaire can be completed, I hope that we can do at least as well on a national basis.

Best wishes for continued success in the year ahead. The committee looks forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Joe L. McCormick

Joe L. McCormick
President

Directions: Please answer the following questions by putting an "X" in the appropriate parentheses. Typically, this will involve putting an "X" on a number or letter between the parentheses. Do not darken the entire area between the parentheses. If you believe that more than one response is appropriate, please only check the most appropriate response. Only one response is required for each question numbered 1-41, 44-49, and 51.

DO NOT MAKE ENTRIES IN THIS AREA-FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Personal and Professional Characteristics

I I I I I [1-4]

1. WHAT IS YOUR TITLE?

(1) Director
(2) Associate Director
(3) Assistant Director
(4) Financial Aid Officer/ Counselor/Advisor
(5) Other (specify) _____ [5]

2. WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

(1) Under 20
(2) 20-25
(3) 26-30
(4) 31-35
(5) 36-40
(6) 41-45
(7) 46-50
(8) 51-59
(9) 60 and over [6]

3. WHAT IS YOUR SEX?

(1) Male
(2) Female [7]

4. WHAT IS YOUR RACE OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND?

(1) Black American
(2) American Indian
(3) Oriental American
(4) Spanish Surnamed American
(5) American Caucasian
(6) Other (specify) _____ [8]

5. ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS (NASFAA)? [9]

(1) Yes
(2) NO

6. WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR EMPLOYMENT?

(1) Full Time
(2) Full Time-9 month assignment
(3) More than half time and less than full time
(4) Half Time
(5) Less than half time [10]

7. WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE AMOUNT OF EMPLOYMENT TIME YOU DEVOTE TO FINANCIAL AID?

(1) 100%
(2) 75-99%
(3) 50-74%
(4) 25-49%
(5) 1-24% [11]

8. IF YOU DEVOTE LESS THAN 100% OF YOUR TIME TO FINANCIAL AID, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PRIMARY OTHER AREA OF RESPONSIBILITIES: (CHECK ONLY ONE)

(1) Dean of Students Office
(2) Office of the Registrar
(3) Office of Career Planning
(4) Office of Admissions
(5) Counseling Center
(6) Academic Affairs Office
(7) Business Office
(8) Teaching
(9) Other (specify) _____ [12]

9. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID?

OFFICE USE ONLY

(1) Less than 1 year (limited experience)
(2) 1 year's experience
(3) 2 years
(4) 3 years
(5) 4 years
(6) 5 years
(7) 6-10 years
(8) 11-15 years
(9) 16 years and over

[13]

10. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION YOU HAVE ACHIEVED?

(1) Doctorate
(2) Masters
(3) Bachelors
(4) Associate
(5) Other (specify) _____

[14]

11. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY?

(A) under $9,000
(B) $9,000-10,999
(C) $11,000-12,999
(D) $13,000-14,999
(E) $15,000-16,999
(F) $17,000-18,999
(G) $19,000-20,999
(H) $21,000-23,999
(I) $24,000-26,999
(J) $27,000-29,999
(K) $30,000-34,999
(L) $35,000+

[15]

12. TENURE

(1) I presently have tenure
(2) I am eligible to receive tenure at a future time
(3) I am not eligible for tenure

[16]

13. HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU WRITTEN OR CALLED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING REGARDING A FINANCIAL AID PROBLEM OR ISSUE?

	A None	B 1-2	C 3-5	D 6-9	E 10+	
1. Office of a U.S. Senator/U.S. Representative	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[17]
2. Federal Official (DHEW/USOE) in Washington	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[18]
3. Federal Official in a USOE Regional Office	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[19]
4. State Senator/State Representative	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[20]
5. State Agency Official	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[21]
6. NASFAA Central Office	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[22]

Institutional Characteristics/Office of Financial Aid Characteristics

14. HOW IS YOUR INSTITUTION CLASSIFIED?

(1) Public
(2) Independent (Private)
(3) Proprietary

[23]

15. WHAT IS THE TYPE OF YOUR INSTITUTION?

OFFICE USE ONLY

(1) Vocational-technical
(2) Less than 2 years (not vocational-technical)
(3) 2 year (not vocational-technical)
(4) 4 year
(5) 4 year and beyond
(6) Nursing
(7) Graduate/professional only

[24]

16. WHAT IS THE TOTAL SIZE OF YOUR INSTITUTION? (Total Headcount Enrollment of students on all Campuses and Departments)

(A) Under 500
(B) 500-999
(C) 1000-1999
(D) 2000-3999
(E) 4000-6999
(F) 7000-9999
(G) 10000-14999
(H) 15000-19999
(I) 20000-29999
(J) 30000-39999
(K) 40000-49999
(L) 50000+

[25]

17. IN WHAT TYPE OF SETTING DO YOU WORK? (Please read all the possible choices before checking the best response)

(1) a single campus institution
(If you checked response number 1 to this question, please skip to question 19)
(2) an academic area (law, medicine, etc.) or an academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.) of a single campus institution
(3) a branch campus
(4) an academic area or an academic level of a branch campus
(5) a main campus with one or more branch campuses
(6) an academic area or an academic level of a main campus with one or more branch campuses
(7) one of the administratively equal campuses of a multi-campus institution
(8) an academic area or an academic level of one of the administratively equal campuses of a multi-campus institution
(9) none of the above

[26]

18. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF THE SETTING (See Question 17) IN WHICH YOU WORK? Total Headcount Enrollment of your campus, academic department (medicine, law, etc.) or academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.)

(A) Under 200
(B) 200-299
(C) 300-499
(D) 500-999
(E) 1000-1999
(F) 2000-3999
(G) 4000-6999
(H) 7000-9999
(I) 10000-14999
(J) 15000-19999
(K) 20000-29999
(L) 30000-39999
(M) 40000+

[27]

19. IN WHICH STATE IS YOUR INSTITUTION LOCATED?

OFFICE USE ONLY

(01)	Ala.	(19)	La.	(37)	Oakl.
(02)	Alaska	(20)	Maine	(38)	Oreg.
(03)	Ariz.	(21)	Md.	(39)	Pa.
(04)	Ark.	(22)	Mass.	(40)	R.I.
(05)	Calif.	(23)	Mich.	(41)	S.C.
(06)	Colo.	(24)	Minn.	(42)	S. Dak.
(07)	Conn.	(25)	Miss.	(43)	Tenn.
(08)	Del.	(26)	Mo.	(44)	Tex.
(09)	D.C.	(27)	Mont.	(45)	Utah
(10)	Fla.	(28)	Nebr.	(46)	Vt.
(11)	Ga.	(29)	Nev.	(47)	Va.
(12)	Hawaii	(30)	N.H.	(48)	Wash.
(13)	Idaho	(31)	N.J.	(49)	W. Va.
(14)	Ill.	(32)	N. Mex.	(50)	Wis.
(15)	Ind.	(33)	N.Y.	(51)	Wyo.
(16)	Iowa	(34)	N.C.	(52)	P.R.
(17)	Kans.	(35)	N. Dak.	(53)	All other
(18)	Ky.	(36)	Ohio		

[28-29]

20. WHAT IS THE TITLE OF YOUR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR?

(A) President or Chancellor
(B) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Student Affairs
(C) Associate/Assistant Chancellor or Vice-President for student affairs
(D) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs/Treasurer
(E) Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs
(F) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs
(G) Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs
(H) Dean of Students
(I) Dean of Academic Affairs
(J) Director of Admissions
(K) Director of Admissions and Financial Aid/Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
(L) Controller/Comptroller
(M) Manager/Administrator
(N) Director or Associate/Assistant Director of Financial Aid
(O) Other (specify) _____

[30]

21. HOW MANY PEOPLE DO YOU OFFICIALLY REPORT THROUGH TO REACH THE PRESIDENT (OR CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER) OF YOUR SCHOOL?

(1)	None	(4)	3 people
(2)	1 person	(5)	4 people
(3)	2 people	(6)	5 or more

[31]

22. WHAT KINDS OF STUDENTS DOES YOUR OFFICE SERVE?

(1) Graduate/Professional Students Only
(2) Undergraduate Students Only
(3) Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional Students

[32]

23. IS YOUR OFFICE CONSIDERED THE CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE ON YOUR CAMPUS?

(1) Yes (2) No

[33]

(if yes, skip to question 24)

If your office is not the Central Financial Aid Office on your campus, indicate the primary academic unit which you serve: (check only one)

OFFICE USE ONLY

(0) Biological & health sciences (excluding nursing)
(1) Nursing
(2) Physical sciences & engineering
(3) Law
(4) Business/Management
(5) Theology
(6) Social Sciences
(7) Language & fine arts
(8) All academic areas
(9) Other (specify) _____

[34]

Attitudes & Opinions

How do you feel about the following statements?

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Moderately Agree	3 Moderately Disagree	4 Strongly Disagree	8 No Opinion or Does Not Apply	
24. I have enough authority to do my job effectively.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[35]
25. My superiors have a clear picture of the kind of job I am doing in financial aid administration.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[36]
26. I am recognized by others in my institution as holding an important position.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[37]
27. In comparison to the salaries in other institutions & to those of individuals not employed in education, my salary is adequate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[38]
28. In comparison to the salaries of others in my institution, my salary is adequate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[39]
29. Financial aid work as a full-time job is sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career for me.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[40]

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Moderately Agree	3 Moderately Disagree	4 Strongly Disagree	8 No Opinion or Does Not Apply	OFFICE USE ONLY
30. Communications from NASFAA & regional SFA associations are generally adequate to keep me up to date with changes in legislation, regulations, & with current issues in financial aid.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[41]
31. Institutions should have increased authority for interfund transfers between the SEOG, CWS, & NDSL programs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[42]
32. My institution would have a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG & GSL programs if we received a federal administrative allowance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[43]
33. In general, professional training activites which I have engaged in as a participant have been adequate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[44]
34. There is a need for periodic program reviews of financial aid offices by U.S. Office of Education staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[45]
35. There should be a formal certification process for financial aid administrators.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[46]
36. The regional review panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[47]
37. My institution has received good support from the Regional U.S. Office of Education.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[48]

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Moderately Agree	3 Moderately Disagree	4 Strongly Disagree	8 No Opinion or Does Not Apply	OFFICE USE ONLY
38. There has been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs at my institution.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[49]
39. The Tri-Partite application process should be revised to depend more heavily on verifiable, historical data.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[50]
40. Even given equal financial need, half-time students are less likely to be assisted than full-time students at my institution.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[51]

41. IF YOU WERE ABLE TO ATTEND ONLY ONE MAJOR CONFERENCE PER YEAR, WHICH ONE WOULD YOU PREFER:

(1) NASFAA National Conference
(2) Your Regional Conference
(3) State
(4) Other (specify) _____ [52]

42. DOES YOUR INSTITUTION PROVIDE PAID RELEASED TIME FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1) Attendance at Aid Meeting within state [53]
(2) Attendance at Aid Meeting out of state [54]
(3) Course work related to the job [55]
(4) Attendance at workshops [56]

43. DOES YOUR INSTITUTION PAY YOUR EXPENSES FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1) Attendance at Aid Meeting within state [57]
(2) Attendance at Aid Meeting out of state [58]
(3) Course work related to the job [59]
(4) Attendance at workshops [60]
(5) Office subscriptions [61]
(6) Individual membership in state association [62]
(7) Individual membership in regional association [63]
(8) Individual membership in national association [64]

The remaining questions are to be answered only by (1) the Director of Financial Aid on your campus, (2) the person solely responsible for the administration of aid on your campus, or (3) the person solely responsible for the administration of aid in a specific academic unit (law, medicine, etc.) or in a specific academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.). If you do not fall into one of the three categories, the survey is now completely filled out and is ready to be returned in the prepaid envelope which is provided. Thank you for your assistance.

OFFICE USE ONLY

44. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF YOUR FULL-TIME STAFF INCLUDING YOURSELF? (use full-time equivalents, i.e., 2 half-time staff members=1 full-time staff member) Check only one box in each of the three rows.

	A None	B 1	C 2-3	D 4-6	E 7-9	F 10-14	G 15-19	H 20-29	I 30+	
A. Professional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[65]
B. Clerical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[66]
C. Student Assistants	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	[67]

45. THE SIZE OF THE FINANCIAL AID STAFF IS ADEQUATE TO COPE WITH THE TASKS CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO US.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Moderately agree
(3) Moderately disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) No opinion

[68]

46. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF AID RECIPIENTS YOUR OFFICE HANDLED DIRECTLY IN 1976-77. (Include all recipients whether or not the FAO selects the recipient-e.g. state scholarships, BEOG's, etc.)

(0) 1-99
(1) 100-249
(2) 250-499
(3) 500-999
(4) 1000-1499
(5) 1500-1999
(6) 2000-3999
(7) 4000-6999
(8) 7000-9999
(9) 10000+

[69]

47. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE AMOUNT OF AID DOLLARS ADMINISTERED BY YOUR OFFICE IN 1976-77. (Include all funds whether or not the FAO selects the recipient)

(0) Under $100,000
(1) $100,000-$249,000
(2) $250,000-$499,000
(3) $500,000-$999,999
(4) $1,000,000-$2,999,999
(5) $3,000,000-$4,999,999
(6) $5,000,000-$7,999,999
(7) $8,000,000-$11,999,999
(8) $12,000,000-$17,999,999
(9) $18,000,000 & over

[70]

48. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS ADMINISTERED BY YOUR FINANCIAL AID OFFICE ARE ASSIGNED ON THE BASIS OF COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED. (Include BEOG funds since their assignment involves a determination of relative family financial strength)

(1) 100%
(2) 90-99%
(3) 80-89%
(4) 70-79%
(5) 60-69%
(6) 50-59%
(7) 40-49%
(8) 30-39%
(9) Under 30%

[71]

49. HAS YOUR OFFICE CONDUCTED ANY RESEARCH PROJECTS RELATING TO FINANCIAL AID TOPICS WITHIN THE PAST TWO YEARS?

OFFICE USE ONLY

(1) YES (2) NO (If no, skip to question 51) [72]

	1 YES	2 NO	
A. Were any of the research projects "analytical" (using tests of statistical significance)?	( )	( )	[73]
B Was assistance received from outside of the institution and/or from researchers who do not normally work for the the office?	( )	( )	[74]
C. Did any of your research projects deal with student attitudes toward either financing postsecondary education or financial aid programs	( )	( )	[75]
D. Did any of your research projects deal with the impact of financial aid programs, e.g. on student or institutional decision making?	( )	( )	[76]

50. HOW WERE THE RESULTS OF YOUR RESEARCH PROJECTS UTILIZED? (CHECK ALL WHICH APPLY)

(1) For internal financial aid office operations & policy making [77]
(2) For dissemination within selected offices or segments of the institution [78]
(3) For publication in a professional journal [79]

51. OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT (Check the one best answer)

(1) My office is responsible for both finding positions for College Work-Study (CWS) students and placing them in these positions.

(2) My office is responsible for finding positions for CWS students.

(3) My office is responsible for placing CWS students.

(4) My office is responsible for finding positions and/or placing students in positions for both the CWS program and other student employment program(s). [80]

(5) My office has little or no responsibility for the student employment program.

(6) The institution does not have a student employment program

(7) Other (specify) _____

Important note: The National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators is in the process of developing a professional library of topics related to student financial aid. If your office has conducted any research projects recently, we would be interested in receiving copies. Similarly, if you are aware of recent master's theses, doctoral disserations, or other papers at your institution relating to student financial aid, would you please forward copies of these to NASFAA or indicate how we can obtain copies:

National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 228
Washington, D.C. 20006

Thank you for taking the time to read and complete this survey. The completed survey should be returned in the envelope which is provided.